

# Development Management Committee

8 December 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, Mr GA Jones, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor PJ Morgan, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland.

[Councillor A Wilcox arrived prior to consideration of the Solicitor's Report (Minute 4 refers)]

[Virtual Meeting: 10.00am – 11.20am; 11.30am – 1.00pm; 1.30pm – 2.25pm]

## 1. Apology

An apology for absence was received from 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:

<b>Application and Reference</b>	<b>Member(s)/Officer(s)</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
<i>Minute 6(a) below</i> NP/21/0651/FUL - Full application for demolition and replacement of dwelling, extension of residential curtilage and associated works – Penyrallt, Mynachologddu	Dr R Plummer	Disclosed a personal interest only and remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion thereon
<i>Minute 6(b) below</i> NP/21/0043/FUL Extension of domestic curtilage and creation of off-road parking for 2 no. vehicles in newly extended area (partially retrospective) – Queens Quarry, Queens Parade, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7EJ	Councillor M Evans	Disclosed a personal interest only and remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion thereon



*Minute 6(g) below*  
NP/21/0579/FUL  
Retrospective  
permission for:  
replacement of obsolete  
UPVC windows and door  
with new wood effect  
UPVC door and sash  
windows; removal of  
rusted and unsafe iron  
railings, replaced with  
glass balustrade; and  
removal of rotten  
wooden gate with metal  
replacement. Installation  
of solar panels  
(permitted development).  
– Lantern Cottage, Little  
Haven, Haverfordwest

Councillor P Morgan

Disclosed a  
personal interest  
only and remained I  
the meeting and  
played a full part in  
the discussion  
thereon

*Minute 7 below*  
EC20/0128 &  
EC21/0126 – Land  
adjacent to Poundland,  
White Lion Street,  
Tenby, Pembrokeshire,  
SA70 7ES

Councillor M Evans

Played no part in  
discussions on this  
matter

### 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 20 October 2021 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 20 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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):*

<b>Reference number</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
NP/21/0651/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Full application for demolition and replacement of dwelling, extension of residential curtilage and associated works – Penyrallt, Mynachlogddu, Clynderwen, Pembrokeshire, SA66 7RU	Huw George – County Councillor Llyr Evans - Agent
NP/21/0043/FUL <i>Minute 6(b) refers</i>	Extension of domestic curtilage and creation of off-road parking for 2 no. vehicles in newly extended area (partially retrospective) – Queens Quarry, Queens Parade, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7EJ	Amanda Twidale – Applicant
NP/21/0120/FUL <i>Minute 6(c) refers</i>	Single storey side extensions with two storey rear gable and single storey green roof – Tal Y Wern, Parrog Road, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0RP	John Griffiths – Chair of Newport Town Council Mr South - Applicant
NP/21/0508/FUL <i>Minute 6(e) Refers</i>	Erection of a dwelling – Dandre, Feidr Ganol, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0RR	John Griffiths – Chair of Newport Town Council Jane Morris - Objector
NP/21/0579/FUL <i>Minute 6(g) refers</i>	Retrospective permission for: replacement of obsolete UPVC windows and door with new wood effect UPVC door and sash windows; removal of rusted and unsafe iron railings, replaced with glass balustrade; and removal of rotten wooden gate with metal replacement. Installation of solar panels	Mr Andrew Lord – Applicant



(permitted development). –  
Lantern Cottage, Little  
Haven, Haverfordwest,  
Pembrokeshire, SA62 3UE

## 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 of applications to be considered, with item 5g) (NP/21/0651/FUL) being considered first, in order to accommodate one of the speakers.

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/21/0651/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs T & G Griffiths  
PROPOSAL: Full application for demolition and replacement of dwelling, extension of residential curtilage and associated works.  
LOCATION: Penyrallt, Mynachlogddu, Clynderwen,  
Pembrokeshire, SA66 7RU

It was reported that Penyrallt consisted of a small complex of buildings which included a two storey dwelling with cat-slide roof, attached garage and store, with a Dutch barn to the rear of the property and a collection of traditional outbuildings on the opposite side of the road.

The existing dwelling had two bedrooms at first floor level, with a kitchen, bathroom, living room and dining room at ground floor level with attached garage at the northern end. The proposed replacement dwelling featured



four bedrooms at lower floor level with kitchen, dining and living rooms at first floor level, labelled as 'upper entrance level'.

A previous application on the site which had proposed the same design as that currently under consideration had been refused under NP/21/0263/FUL under the extended delegation procedure. The only alteration to the scheme previously refused was the addition of an area to the south to provide for a drainage scheme.

The site lay within the Mynydd Preseli Registered Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales (LCA 27) and within the open countryside as defined by the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park adopted Local Development Plan (LDP). The building was a typically vernacular traditional building and the Authority's Building Conservation Officer had been consulted, and had objected to the principle of demolishing the existing dwelling, commenting that the vast majority of buildings across the National Park were not protected by listing or conservation area status, yet they formed the backbone of its built heritage. Given the protected status of the landscape – of which buildings were a critical part – the principle of replacement was only acceptable when a property was deemed beyond repair or had been wholly altered so as to lose its character and form. Neither was the case here – and he felt that the reasons put forward did not at all justify demolition.

Whilst there was no LDP or Welsh Government policy to require an assessment of embodied carbon, the replacement of a traditional vernacular building could not be seen as sustainable without significant justification, but in the absence of any policy specifying this, this could not reasonably be used as a reason for refusal.

However, the replacement of a dwelling which had a traditional scale and character and which sat gently within the landscape of the National Park and its replacement by one with little or no architectural merit or traditional features could not be supported as it would lead to a loss of visual and historic character, contrary to Policies 8, 14 and 29 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

At the meeting, it was reported that a structural survey had been submitted by the applicant which set out the likely causes of damp within the house and which stated that the cost of building new would be comparable to the cost of improving the existing, however a new building would have many more benefits. A further objection had also been received from the Community Council which stated that support should be given to a local family.



Officers had concluded that the area was a sensitive part of the National Park with a strong local character, and the proposed design was suburban in nature with a scale, bulk and form that were out of character. In addition, the loss of the form of the historic farmstead was considered to be to the detriment of the character and special qualities of the National Park.

Most Members noted that they had received a letter from the applicants, together with the structural survey and as officers had not received the letter its contents was summarised for them. The Director of Planning and Park Direction advised that although the structural survey was a material consideration, personal circumstances could only be taken into consideration in exceptional circumstances and in this instance the matters referred to in the letter were not relevant.

The first of two speakers for this application was County Councillor Huw George. He considered that approval of the application was important for a number of reasons – for the applicants as a local young family to return to the area, for the rural community which suffered from the migration of young people to more urban areas and for the promotion of the local culture – and quoted a Tahitian proverb “The life of the land is the life of the people”; these were two such people. He went on to explain that this young, local family wanted to return to live and work in Pembrokeshire and to support the community in which their extended family lived, and had done so for six generations.

Councillor George referred to the challenging standards of the National Park which the applicants were prepared to meet in creating a family home that sat naturally in the landscape. Referring to the existing dwelling, he noted that anything was salvageable, however the effort, energy and economy of restoring the building, which he described as wet rather than damp due to runoff from the mountain, was not considered to be worthwhile. The applicants wanted to replace the original dwelling to create their family home, one that was energy efficient and suitable for the modern age. He pointed out that the building was not listed and no objections had been received from any of the statutory consultees. He also referred to the Welsh Government’s goal of recording 1 million Welsh speakers by 2050 and noted that approving the application would add 4 in respect of achieving Pembrokeshire’s part of that goal.

In response to a question regarding the opinion of the Community Council, Councillor George explained that they had not been able to meet due to Covid, however they wanted to support their community and a family which had been there for generations, in creating a family home.



The second speaker was Llyr Evans, the agent, who explained that the applicant's objective had been to provide an efficient and functional home for themselves and they had commissioned Gareth Dauncey from Cardigan as architect for the scheme. The house had formerly been owned by Mrs Griffiths' grandmother and the application would provide them with an opportunity to be close to other family members living in the area. Noting that this was not a listed building, and was typical of many in the county, the agent referred to the officer's report which says there was a lack of justification for demolition of the property. He stated that there was no basis in planning for this approach as it was not supported by planning policy or guidance; on the contrary, Welsh Government advised that replacement dwellings could improve the energy efficiency of the housing stock. He therefore welcomed the comments in the meeting regarding the principle of demolition although he was still unclear if officers would continue to object to such a scheme.

Turning then to the design of the property, which seemed to be of greatest concern to officers, he advised that the sloping nature of the site allowed for first floor living. The property would be set back from the existing footprint and the highway and this would allow a greater appreciation of the view. The ridge height of the proposed dwelling was only marginally higher than the existing, and the sloping nature of the site, barn and trees to the east would act as a backdrop. Most views would be from the west, from which vantage point the property sat comfortably in the landscape as demonstrated by the cross section provided. The scale would largely be the same in footprint and length and the gable, pitch and materials were traditional. The applicants were happy to include stone within the design. Only the fenestration was not traditional, however he considered that the design combined this contemporary element in the shell of a traditional form. He noted that the National Park contained many contemporary buildings which fitted within its character and believed that the proposed dwelling was well designed in its context to provide an efficient and modern property which contributed to the policies of the wellbeing of future generations. It would have a lower carbon footprint than the existing dwelling, even after its renovation and would provide a more efficient use of energy, thus providing a sustainable development which sat comfortably in the landscape. The agent concluded that the property would be a home for a young Welsh speaking family who would contribute to the community and counter the current trend of second homes. He noted that no objections had been received from consultees and the Community Council had supported the application. He therefore asked for the support of the Committee in approving the application.

In response to questions from Members, the agent confirmed that this was a private, family owned farm, albeit one that was part of a wider holding. Also there had been no real dialogue with officers regarding the



design as there had been no agreement regarding the principle of demolition of the existing property. Without discussion with his clients, he was unable to agree their willingness to submit an alternative design, however he believed they may be open to such a possibility as living at Penyrallt was important to them. He conceded that the only discussions since the previous refusal had concerned drainage, in response to issues raised by Natural Resources Wales.

While Members were sympathetic to the family circumstances of the applicants, wishing them the best in their efforts to return to living in the county, it was acknowledged that these were not material and could not be taken into consideration, although it was noted that the fact that the site was located in a Welsh language sensitive area might have some relevance. They also acknowledged that there was a delicate balance between restoring the existing building in order to preserve the area's exceptional landscape and providing an energy efficient dwelling, and opinions both for and against demolition of the property were expressed by Members. However most Members were not happy with the urban nature of the design of the proposed dwelling and were disappointed that further discussions had not been undertaken prior to submission of the second application. The recommendation of refusal was moved and seconded.

Other Members, however felt that the existing building was an eyesore in its present condition and didn't believe that the proposal was unsympathetic and approval of the application would replace an old, damp building with one that was more energy efficient as well as encouraging a young Welsh speaking family to stay in the area. A site visit was also proposed but this was not seconded.

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

- 1. The proposed replacement dwelling does not conserve or enhance the landscape of the National Park, and is thus contrary to Policies 1, 8, 14 and 29 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan, the spirit of TAN12, and the guidance in Planning Policy Wales.**

[The Committee was adjourned between 11.20am and 11.30am]





- (b) REFERENCE: NP/21/0043/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms A Twidale  
PROPOSAL: Extension of domestic curtilage and creation of off-road parking for 2 no. vehicles in newly extended area (partially retrospective)  
LOCATION: Queens Quarry, Queens Parade, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7EJ

It was reported that retrospective planning permission was sought for the extension of the domestic curtilage and the creation of off-road parking for 2 no. vehicles and a turning area in the newly extended curtilage. The extension of the curtilage was at a significantly lower level than the dwelling itself, and the development proposed to retain/ reinstate soft landscaping and vegetation to the area, which had previously been heavily vegetated, and proposed a rockfall mesh/ netting system to the face of the now exposed cliff.

Officers considered that the site of the parking area was appropriate and would provide off road parking in an area where street parking facilities were limited. The proposals would also allow for sufficient visibility over the footpath and would prevent parking which would obstruct the footpath in front of the junction.

The Authority's Tree and Landscape Officer and Planning Ecologist had requested that, as the site was previously well vegetated, a landscaping scheme be submitted to the Authority to include native species which would benefit pollinators as well as appropriate management. However it was noted at the meeting that this had not been reflected in the list of recommended conditions. It was therefore requested that an additional condition be included stating that, "Prior to any further development at this site, a scheme for landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of both hard landscaping (including details of the bollards, walls and stone piers) and soft landscaping (including species mix and locations for planting of trees, shrubs and ground cover). It shall also include details of the timing of the landscaping works and their on-going management."

The proposed development was considered acceptable in terms of its scale, design, siting and materials and would not detrimentally affect the character of the existing dwelling, the visual amenity of the surrounding area or the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with the policies of the Local Development Plan. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to inclusion of the additional condition.



Members asked questions regarding the responses submitted by Tenby Civic Society and Tenby Town Council and the Development Management Team Leader advised that these related to the hardening of the access, concerns over conflict with pedestrians and the potential instability of the rock face, however the provision of landscaping was welcomed. He also confirmed that a dropped curb would need to be provided. Members also asked how much of the rock face would be lost in order to provide the parking area and the officer advised that he believed little would be removed.

The applicant, Amanda Twidale, then addressed the Committee. She confirmed that a dropped curb would be required and that she would pay for that in line with guidance from the Streetcare Team. She also confirmed that the bench outside the boundary wall would remain and that none of the rock wall would be lost. Excavations had taken place in order to ascertain whether hardstanding could be laid, and this had exposed an existing small hole which was full of rubble. The rock wall would be covered with mesh at a low level, however any loose material would have fallen onto the cars or hardstanding, rather than into the road.

In response to another question, she confirmed that parking was a problem in the area, particularly in the summer months, as the property had only one permitted space.

The recommendation of approval with the additional condition was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the application, accordance with approved plans and documents, landscaping, materials, drainage, spaces to be used only for parking of motor vehicles and any access gates to open away from the highway.**

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/21/0120/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs South  
PROPOSAL: Single storey side extensions with two storey rear gable and single storey green roof  
LOCATION: Tal Y Wern, Parrog Road, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0RP

It was reported that the site of the development lay facing the estuary in Newport and was located on the edge of the Newport Conservation Area. The house currently had 4 bedrooms at first floor level, with a kitchen, 2 receptions and office at ground floor level. The application had been significantly amended since its original submission in February 2021 and the revised design would provide for increased bedroom areas at first



floor, and an additional 5th bedroom at ground floor level with a studio and home office. The revised design featured standing seam zinc roofing to provide a contemporary contrast to the natural slate. One letter of objection had been received.

In terms of siting, design and impact upon the special qualities of the National Park, it was noted that the comments of the Conservation Officer were reproduced in the report, but that he had welcomed the amendments to the scheme and had no adverse comment subject to a suggested reduction in the amount of glazing and a schedule of materials to be provided.

The property was set back from the coastal path, and when viewed from it, the level of glazing was now considered acceptable, as it was principally the first floor which was visible within the wider landscape, and the removal of the first-floor glazed balconies which were originally proposed had also significantly improved the acceptability of the proposals.

In conclusion, officers considered that the proposed scheme was acceptable in terms of scale, form, use and design. The development would not cause an unacceptably detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park, nor would it 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 2 2020 and could be supported.

Members asked a number of questions regarding the level of glazing (which the officer estimated would increase by just under 50%), mitigation of light spillage and materials proposed.

The first of two speakers was John Griffiths, Chair of Newport Town Council. He explained that the Town Council was concerned about the sensitivity of the site, which was visible from the well-used coast path, but also from the northern and southern shores, as well as Traeth Mawr. In addition the property was in the line of sight of those who looked to Carningli from the Parrog. The Council was also concerned regarding the changes to the plans and cautioned against the thinking that the design was now acceptable, because the original had been so bad; it needed to be considered on its own merits. They believed that the glazing was overwhelming and while the Council had previously been reassured that a lighting condition could be imposed, this would not address concerns over internal lighting, and there was no overhanging roof which could help to mitigate. They were also concerned about the Juliet balcony which was felt to be a fad. He noted that the Conservation Officer had



recommended a reduction in glazing, however only a minimal reduction had been proposed; they also did not believe that the use of zinc as a building/roofing material was acceptable in the town. Finally, noting the references to the rear elevation of the dwelling, Councillor Griffiths pointed out that this was the one that overlooked the estuary and coast path and caused greatest concern.

The second speaker was Mr South, the applicant. He explained that he had been born in Pembrokeshire and was proud to have now moved back to live full time, contributing to the community and engaging in the fabric of it. His children regarded Newport as their home, and it was their only home, however the house was ready to move onto its next chapter, and there were opportunities for efficiencies and improvements. Mr South noted that he had received positive support from neighbours and the wider community. He stated that he had been through an extensive planning journey and thanked the Authority and the planning officer for her uncompromising guidance. The outcome, he believed, was the design of a great home to live in for the rest of their lives. In response to some of the concerns expressed regarding reflection from the windows, he advised that as that elevation faced north, the sun hardly ever reached that side of the building, and that it was some 150/160m from the coast path.

While some Members expressed sympathy for the design and the improvements, it was questioned whether the cladding previously proposed would be less stark than the white render. The officer advised that the Conservation Officer had suggested that render would match the adjacent property and therefore be less heavy and more appropriate. She added that zinc was a contemporary material which had a recessive grey colouration like slate.

Reservations were also expressed with regard to the amount of fenestration and whether the suggested condition would be sufficient to control light spillage in what was a highly sensitive location. Officers advised that conditions to control internal lighting were not used as they were difficult to enforce and therefore not reasonable, however reference was made to another application which had been allowed on appeal which was glazed from floor to ceiling.

Although the officer's recommendation of approval was proposed and seconded, some Members advised that they would be unable to vote in favour due to the likely impact of light spillage – particularly from the beach and the other side of the river – and the visual intrusion of the proposals, which although an improvement, were not considered to be good enough.



**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, biodiversity enhancement and light mitigation strategy.**

[Councillor A Wilcox was not present for the vote on the following application]

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/21/0211/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Will Crockford  
PROPOSAL: Retrospective Planning permission as built including retaining wall, parking & turning areas and change of use from garage to annexe.  
LOCATION: Seren Y Mor, 17 Haytor Gardens, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 8HW

It was reported that this site comprised a large two storey detached dwelling, set in a large plot, at the head of a cul de sac. Retrospective planning permission was sought for the retention of the retaining wall, parking and turning area and the annexe. The annexe housed a seating/dining room with a kitchenette, 2 bedrooms, a bathroom and a water closet.

Two letters of objection had been received, the key points of which were summarised in the report, and Tenby Town Council had also recommended the application be refused because of its retrospective nature.

Officers considered the retaining wall to be acceptable, and did not harm the character of the street scene and the parking and turning area were considered acceptable. The Highway Authority had requested conditions relating to surfacing with bitmac and leaving the access unimpeded by gates or barriers. It was reported at the meeting that the surfacing had already been carried out.

Turning to the change of use of the annexe, there had been no increase in size of the building and no additional windows were proposed. Officers did not consider there had been any additional impact upon the street scene. Due to the siting of the dwelling in relation to neighbouring properties, sufficient distance would be maintained and there were no undue impacts to the amenity or privacy above that which was currently enjoyed.

It was noted that the change of use of a garage/outbuilding to an annex to be used as additional accommodation serving the host dwelling did not always require planning permission. A suitably worded condition was



proposed to ensure its sole use was ancillary to the host dwelling. This would prevent the annex being occupied separately to the main dwelling.

Officers concluded that notwithstanding the objections raised, the development was considered to comply with the relevant policies and to be acceptable in terms of scale, form, use and design. The development 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, and ecology and landscape features would not be adversely affected by the development. The recommendation was therefore one of approval subject to conditions.

Members were disappointed with the retrospective nature of the application, and the ability of officers to enforce all the conditions imposed on planning applications was questioned. They were also concerned by the inclusion of a kitchen within the annexe, but were reassured by officers that there was no definition of a separate curtilage to the building and the inclusion of condition 6 would prevent its use as a holiday let.

Noting the potential impact of the development to trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order, Members were also concerned that damage had already taken place. Officers advised that the Tree and Landscape Officer had previously visited the area and would visit again now that work was complete, and any action would be the subject of a report to a future meeting.

The recommendation of approval was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to accordance with plans and documents, access, parking and turning, surface water drainage, no occupation other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling and submission of a scheme for biodiversity enhancement.**

[Dr R Heath-Davies and Councillors P Baker, K Doolin, P Kidney and S Yelland tendered their apologies and left the meeting at this juncture]

[The Committee adjourned for lunch between 1.00pm and 1.30pm].

[Councillor M Evans and Dr R Plummer were not present during consideration of the following 2 applications]



- (e) REFERENCE: NP/21/0508/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mrs M Jenkins  
PROPOSAL: Erection of a dwelling  
LOCATION: Dandre, Feidr Ganol, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42  
ORR

It was reported that Approval was sought for a detached, pitched roofed, 1.5 storey 2 bed unit on Feidr Ganol, a single lane road linking onto Parrog Road to the east, located on the edge of the town's defining grid layout and leading down to the Estuary. Following concerns over the limited size of the curtilage and amenity space, it was noted that the application had been amended since originally submitted.

Five letters of objection had been received from residents concerned with: road safety, cramming in holiday lets, loss of views, impacts of parking on verges, ribbon development and urbanisation. Newport Town Council had also recommended that the application be refused.

The site was within the Centre boundary for Newport as defined in LDP2, and the principle of providing a dwelling in this location was considered to be acceptable subject to the submission of a Unilateral Undertaking in respect of a commuted payment towards affordable housing.

The Highway Authority had been consulted in respect to any potential impact on traffic or highway safety and they had recommended conditional consent. No enhancements to the highway network had been sought.

Officers considered that the proposed scheme was acceptable in terms of scale, form, use and design. The development would not cause an unacceptably detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park and was not considered to cause an unacceptable impact upon privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties. Ecology and landscape features would not be adversely affected by the development. It was noted that the title document for the land was currently being changed, and once this was completed a Unilateral Undertaking would be submitted. Therefore the recommendation was one of delegated approval.

At the meeting, it was pointed out that the block plan contained within the papers was incorrect. The officer advised that the amendments had changed the curtilage, but not the shape of the dwelling, however the correct block plan had been shown in the slides presented.

The first speaker was Councillor John Griffiths, Chair of Newport Town Council. He drew Members' attention to their response which had been



reproduced as part of the Officer's report and highlighted the question of access. He advised that the Town Council had no issues regarding the design of the proposed dwelling, but were concerned by the shared use of Feidr Ganol by pedestrians and vehicles and the resultant problems of road safety. These would only be increased by the creation of an additional dwelling. He confirmed that the Town Council had been given to understand there was little prospect of provision of a pavement on the A487 through the town and therefore Feidr Ganol would continue to be used as a link to the town centre.

Jane Morris, an objector, then addressed the Committee, speaking on behalf of herself and some neighbours, and she set out five reasons why the development should be refused. Firstly she did not believe that the layout was fit for purpose as two cars parked next to each would have insufficient room to open their doors; secondly she did not believe that the gap between the walls at the entrance was sufficient for delivery vehicles to park and they would therefore block the lane. Ms Morris also believed that the current proposals would allow parking for only one car at Dandre which would be insufficient if it became a holiday let sleeping 12-14 people; she was disappointed to hear that officers considered this potential change of use to be irrelevant, as she felt it would lead to an increase in parking along the lane. Her fourth point was that the development would lead to an adverse impact on the quality of Feidr Ganol and the Conservation Area as the feel of the lane would become more urbanised by creating a ribbon of four closely spaced properties. Finally the development would not enhance the Conservation Area as it would block a view that had been considered sufficiently important to be numbered in the 2011 Conservation Area Statement.

Ms Morris concluded by saying that while the development might benefit the owners, it would not enhance the town, the Conservation Area nor the special qualities of Feidr Ganol. As a neighbour, she stated that she was frequently unable to turn left outside her property due to the problem of cars parked on the lane as a result of other properties with insufficient parking, and this development would significantly exacerbate the problem.

Having listened to the speakers, it was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred and the site inspected by the Committee.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow a Committee site inspection to take place.**





- (f) REFERENCE: NP/21/0577/FUL  
APPLICANT: Compton  
PROPOSAL: Residential development of 11 dwellings (including 2 affordable)  
LOCATION: Land adjacent to Cefn Gallod, Trefin, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 5AP

It was reported that this application sought full planning permission for the erection of 2 affordable houses and 9 open market houses. The site was currently a green field site, allocated for residential development within the Local Development Plan and would be accessed off Cefn Gallod.

The application was a major development and was of public interest, as such, it was requested that Members consider a Committee site visit to view the site and its surroundings prior to consideration of the planning application at a subsequent Committee meeting.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow a Committee site inspection to take place.**

[Councillor M Evans returned to the meeting during consideration of the following application and abstained from voting on it.]

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/21/0579/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr A Lord  
PROPOSAL: Retrospective permission for: replacement of obsolete UPVC windows and door with new wood effect UPVC door and sash windows; removal of rusted and unsafe iron railings, replaced with glass balustrade; and removal of rotten wooden gate with metal replacement. Installation of solar panels (permitted development)  
LOCATION: Lantern Cottage, Little Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3UE

It was reported that the application site was a mid-terrace two storey dwelling located on Settlands Hill, within Little Haven Conservation Area. The retrospective development comprised of replacement doors and windows, removal of railings and replacement with glass balustrade, removal of rotten wooden gate with metal replacement. Solar panels had been installed and were shown on the proposed plans, however these were considered to represent permitted development.

Little Haven was subject to an Article 4(2) Direction which conditionally restricted certain permitted development rights, applicable to fenestration/doors fronting public areas, front boundaries and hard-



standings. The Direction had been made on 17/06/2015 and confirmed 23/09/2015, being made to counter both the loss of small details and the introduction of features not considered to enhance or preserve the character of the Conservation Area. All frontages within the Little Haven Conservation Area were subject to Article 4 (2) Direction controls, which prevented any alterations being undertaken to principal or highway frontages within the conservation area, without first securing the benefit of planning permission.

The property the subject of the application was prominently located within the Little Haven Conservation Area and the addition of the glass balustrade to the principle elevation was not considered acceptable, being an intrusive and alien feature within the Conservation Area and failing to preserve its character or appearance. The new windows, door and replacement gate were considered appropriate and could be supported.

Therefore officers considered the retrospective scheme as a whole to be unacceptable in terms of its form, and design. The development caused an unacceptably detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park and Little Haven Conservation Area. As such, the development did not comply with policies of the adopted Local Development Plan 2 2020 and the recommendation was one of refusal.

It was noted at the meeting that a glass balustrade at a neighbouring property had been refused permission under delegated powers. It was also pointed out that there was an error in the report in that the reference to an enforcement case referred to a different property.

The officer confirmed for Members that although there was no objection to the windows, door or gate, it was not possible to approve some aspects of an application and refuse others. Therefore the application would have to be approved or refused in its entirety. However any enforcement action would focus upon the balustrade, although a further application would be expected to regularise the development.

There was one speaker, Andrew Lord, the applicant. He began by commenting on the retrospective nature of the application, and said that he was not in favour of such applications and tried always to follow proper process, however he had purchased the property in 2019 from a local builder and had incorrectly assumed that planning permission had been granted for the refurbishment works. He was now trying to regularise the situation. Given that officers supported the other works, his speech would focus on the glass balustrade. Although he had never seen the previous metal railings, he understood that following investigations, they had needed to be replaced. He said that he liked the glass balustrade, which was clear, non-reflective, and opened up views of the cottage to passers-



by; he had received many positive comments on the work undertaken and how it had improved the entrance to the village.

Mr Lord noted that the reason for refusal was that the balustrade failed to preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and the report indicated that it should be replaced with metal railings, however he considered this view to be subjective. He stated that the Conservation Area Proposals made no mention of metal railings, and having looked around the village, he could find no more than a single property with railings. He therefore did not believe they could be described as traditional and were just as alien as a balustrade, the predominant boundary being stone walls. He quoted two examples of balustrades that had been approved in the village, both built into shelves in the highway on top of a high stone retaining wall – one in a prominent position by the beach and the other in Wesley Road which was visible from most key aspects in the village. He questioned why these were acceptable and the one at his property was not? It was unfair. He noted that as a small village, everyone knew what was going on, and he had not received a single negative comment, with the development supported by the Community Council. He asked whose subjective opinion mattered most – those who looked after the village, or those who lived there. He considered the recommendation to be a subjective application of policy by planners, and one that had not been applied evenly across the village.

The officer noted that this was a mid-terrace property, and the Conservation Officer considered that the balustrades were out of keeping and detracted from the Conservation Area. She noted that there were a couple of active enforcement cases in respect of other properties and that of the two instances of balustrades that had been granted permission, one was a modern property and the other a larger detached property and in each case they were considered acceptable.

Members felt that it was desirable to keep traditional features alive, and the recommendation of refusal was moved and seconded.

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

- 1. The principal elevation of the property is prominent within the Little Haven Conservation Area. Within this context the introduction of the glass balustrade is an intrusive and alien feature within the conservation area. The balustrading sits as a prominent feature within a traditional setting topping a historic stone wall, this is harmful to the character of this area of the Little Haven Conservation Area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the duty placed on the Local Planning Authority to preserve or enhance a conservation area under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and**



**Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and policies 1,8 & 14 of the adopted Local Development Plan (2020).**

**7. Matters relating to enforcement - EC20/0128 & EC21/0126 – Land adjacent to Poundland, White Lion Street, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7ES**

It was reported that In October 2020 it had been brought to the attention of the Authority that there had been a breach of planning control involving the change of use of land to unauthorised stationing and use of a mobile coffee and donut van at land adjacent Poundland, White Lion Street, Tenby in the Tenby Conservation Area. This had subsequently been removed but had periodically reappeared. The owner did not concede that it required planning permission as he believed its mobility gave it immunity. The Authority would not wish to approve it in its present location which was considered to adversely affect the Tenby Conservation Area.

A Planning Contravention Notice had subsequently been served on the owner of the property, however this was not returned, and despite several letters the Planning Contravention Notice had still not been returned to the Authority.

Members were saddened that the necessary form had not been completed as this formed part of a due process. However it was suggested that, in the interests of cost effectiveness, the Authority had been too lenient in continuing to write to the landowner over a period of some 4 months, rather than taking action sooner.

It was **resolved** that the Head of Development Management be authorised to instruct solicitors to commence prosecution proceedings in the Magistrates Court for the non-return of the Planning Contravention Notice.

**8. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader 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.

**NOTED.**

**9. Seasons Greetings**

The Chair wished everyone a merry Christmas.

