

Development Management Committee

18 May 2022

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

Councillor P Baker BEM, Mrs D Clements, Councillor M Evans, Councillor P Harries, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs S Hoss, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor PJ Morgan and Councillor S Yelland.

[Councillor A Wilcox joined the meeting following consideration of the Solicitor's Report (minute 5 refers).]

[Virtual Meeting: 10.00am – 11.50am; 12.05pm – 1.25pm]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor K Doolin, Dr M Havard, Councillor P Kidney, Dr RM Plummer and Councillor M Williams.

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>Minutes 6(d) below</i> NP/22/0092/FUL – Construction of a new pair of wheelchair access lifts – Riverslea, Golf Course Road, Newport	Councillor P Harries	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 9 March 2022 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 9 March 2022 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/21/0653/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Proposed rear alterations & extension to dwelling, including new roof profile & dormer, changes to fenestration, with additional home office/garden/guest room & shed ancillary to dwelling – 5 Woodside, Blue Anchor Way, Dale	Lyn Jones – Dale Community Council
NP//21/0399/FUL <i>Minute 6(b) refers</i>	The retrospective construction of a livestock barn and works to / related to a silage clamp to support functioning of the working farm – land opposite Middle Broadmoor, Talbenny	Louise Cunningham – Objector Geraint John - Agent
NP/21/0743/FUL <i>Minute 6(c) refers</i>	Proposed residential development of 15 dwellings and associated works – Land adjacent to the Primary School, Trewarren Road, St Ishmaels	Sonja Groves – Head Teacher of Coastland School – objector Rob Davies - Agent

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 in order to facilitate public participation, the order of the agenda had been altered such that item 5b) would be considered first.]

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/21/0653/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs C & A Millership – Walwyn-Jones
PROPOSAL: Proposed rear alterations & extension to dwelling, including new roof profile & dormer, changes to fenestration, with additional home office/garden/guest room & shed ancillary to dwelling
LOCATION: 5 Woodside, Blue Anchor Way, Dale

It was reported that this property was a single storey ex Local Authority semi-detached bungalow that sat on a modest plot. The proposals comprised a first floor box dormer window extension which spanned the rear width of the property, a raised outbuilding at the rear of the curtilage and a rear flat roofed extension with a raised patio area. The outbuilding featured a grass roof and was described as a home office/guest room.

The proposed development was located to the rear of the property and its visibility from any public vantage points was mitigated by the recessive nature of materials used for the proposed dormer. As such there were no significant overriding concerns in respect of visual impact from the street scene. The siting, design and scale were not likely to lead to harm to the special qualities of the wider landscape of the National Park but would have more localised impacts. However, the rear dormer, by virtue of its size, siting, design and bulk, represented an overly dominant and disproportionate addition to the roof of the property which was considered to represent a poor standard of design and was contrary to the design guidance issued in Technical Advice Note (TAN) 12 (Design).

Since the application had first been submitted, concerns as to the acceptability of the plans had led to the rear extension being reduced by 550mm and privacy screens resized. However this was considered to insufficiently address officers concerns relating to the impact on neighbouring amenity space and the overbearing nature of the design. The combination of the scale and height of the dormer window taken with



the overbearing impact of the outbuilding were likely to be detrimental to neighbouring amenity. They could also be considered to be an inappropriate level of overdevelopment of this modestly sized dwelling.

In addition, the proposed balcony over the rear extension would allow for views directly into the rear garden area of number 4, adversely affecting the existing privacy standards. The proposed elevation plan showed the existing boundary screening would not be of a sufficient height to mitigate any overlooking. Whilst an obscured glass balustrade was proposed at 1.6m height, this was directly on the balcony and would not provide an acceptable level of privacy as occupants standing on the balcony, might be able to have direct views into number 4. Consequently, the proposed development was considered to infringe the privacy standards of number 4 to the detriment of private amenity.

The Garden Room, which was intended to be used as a home office and for guest accommodation, was also considered to have a significantly overbearing impact and would have views back onto neighbouring properties that would be both intrusive and out of character with the surrounding development.

In conclusion, following detailed consideration of the application, the development would result in a significant loss of privacy and amenity which severely detracted from the enjoyment of neighbouring properties. The provision of an obscure glazing screen would not overcome any issue of overlooking of neighbouring properties. As such, the development was considered to be contrary to policies of the Local Development Plan 2 and the recommendation was one of refusal. It was requested at the meeting that the first reason for refusal be amended to refer to the proposed development, not just the raised balcony, constituting an un-neighbourly form of development.

The report noted that a similar application had been received in respect of the neighbouring property and for which planning permission had been granted. However the Director of Planning and Park Direction, presenting the application in the absence of the Planning Officer, explained that this was a more modest scheme which was set back further from the highway and had a lesser visual impact.

Mr Lyn Jones from Dale Community Council then addressed the Committee. He stated that the neighbour at number 6 was not objecting to the proposals, but had expressed concerns that the single storey extension could cause damp to her property. He advised that Dale Community Council was supporting the application, noting that the village had a dwindling number of residents living there, and this was of concern. The village therefore needed homes of a suitable size to live in that were



affordable and there were few of these. They therefore wanted to support a local, young, growing family to stay in the village and they were content to lose the existing street view through the addition of a dormer to facilitate this. It was noted that the applicant worked from home and needed a quiet space in which to do so. Such arrangements were becoming more commonplace and allowances had to be made.

A letter had been received from the applicants, Annie Walwyn-Jones & Chris Millership, noting that they were unable to attend in person as the birth of their first baby was imminent. Therefore their statement was read by the Deputy Monitoring Officer. They believed that the proposed development was less intrusive on the village than other applications that had been passed in recent times. They were trying to create a home in which they could raise a young family and therefore needed a separate workspace to allow a work/life separation and a believed that a self contained garden room replacing the shed already in existence was justified in the current 'work from home' climate. They noted that the two upstairs bedrooms had little usable space and limited storage due to the height restrictions of the roof line and therefore they wished to dormer the rear of the house to create head height and floor space. An additional shower and toilet could also be created upstairs. The proposed ground floor extension would provide additional living and storage space as the current arrangement provided a cramped sitting areas and dining space.

The applicants did not believe that they were overdeveloping the site as the footprint of the property would not be increased, but not having a full dormer on the property wouldn't allow the property to meet their needs. They stated that they had reduced the size of the ground floor extension as a compromise, but did not feel able to compromise any further. The outdoor garden room was also essential to allow continued home working. They considered the impact of the dormer from the road to be minimal, and that the materials would cause it to blend in seamlessly; the original bungalow profile still read as the dominant structure, and not overdeveloped. Attention was drawn to a number of other developments within the village that had gained approval and these were considered to have a greater visual impact.

Noting that the works needed to be cost effective for the gains in space achieved, they would allow the applicants to live in the village where they had settled and bring up a family within the community of Dale. The village was crying out for permanent residents with young families to keep it alive. The bungalow at Woodside had been built for older people, however it only became suitable for families if it was modified and adapted to modern living standards. They believed the proposals were sensitive to neighbours with screening and ground levels. The applicants noted that they would have bought a larger home within Dale if the pricing



in the market and availability of properties had allowed. They noted that they had applied only for what was needed as a bare minimum. Drawing attention to the support of Dale Community Council and individuals in the community, they asked the Committee to grant permission for them to make the house into a family home.

Members views were split on whether permission should be granted or not, with support being expressed for young families to remain in the village and the lack of affordable family accommodation that was available. However the strong phrasing in the officer's report that the development would severely detract from the enjoyment of neighbouring properties and the suggestion from officers that an acceptable scheme was possible, led to a proposition to refuse the application. Other Members noted that the relatively small changes being requested by officers were of little consequence, however the officer noted that the amendments had been discussed with the agent and no further compromises were possible.

The vote to refuse the application was lost, and a proposition was made to approve the application. The Director of Planning and Park Direction advised that she would not be invoking the Authority's 'Cooling Off' period in respect of this application, however she asked that conditions for any approval be delegated to officers, and the motion was amended in this respect. Having been told that Ms Walwyn-Jones had given birth that morning, Members asked that the Authority's congratulations be passed to the applicants.

DECISION: That the application be approved, subject to conditions which were delegated to the Director of Planning and Park Direction.

- (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

This application was reported to the Committee at the request of one of its Members. The recommendation of approval was also contrary to the views of The Havens Community Council.

Retrospective consent was sought for a silage pit and livestock shed on two separate sites accessed off the unclassified access road. The silage pit and shed were required to support the functioning of the farming business at Lower Broadmoor Farm. The shed and silage pit had been located away from the main complex of farm buildings so as to provide



young stock a degree of separation from the main herd to help prevent the spread of TB. The sites chosen were situated on previously developed land associated with the former WW2 aerodrome. The shed was predominantly screened from the wider area by an existing hedge bank and existing trees/scrub running along the road boundary. However it was visible at a distance, from the PCNP Coast Path and was situated on the skyline so was visible from the wider landscape.

The application had been considered by the Authority's Agricultural Advisor who had advised that while the shed was not justified purely on TB management grounds, its location served a functional, practical purpose within the farm management and its location was deemed acceptable.

While the development in its current form did have some adverse impact on the landscape character of the area, it was considered that there were options to mitigate the visual impact and to conserve and enhance the landscape, these would include substantial planting schemes at both sites, to integrate with the nearby hedgerows, trees and scrub and/or grouping the developments together with a substantial, integrating planting scheme; this would have additional ecological benefits.

Natural Resources Wales (NRW) had been consulted on the application and had commented that the two sites were elevated and exposed and did not relate well to the historic pattern of farmsteads in the area. The building was not sensitively designed nor locally distinctive and they did not consider that the proposals enhanced either site, since they introduced larger buildings and structures and provided no mitigation. Following submission of a planting scheme, NRW had been re-consulted and gave no objection to the proposal and supported the landscaping scheme which would be referenced in the proposed conditions. A light mitigation strategy would also be conditioned to prevent any unnecessary light spillage from the development.

Objections had been received as set out in the report, largely based on the increase of traffic/highway safety and the associated noise resulting from agricultural machinery, but also regarding the siting of the barn close to the neighbouring holiday camping business. However officers considered that as the site was separated from its neighbour by the highway, mature hedging and was set back from the boundary of the highway, the shed would not be visible from the neighbouring properties and the operational needs of the farm necessitated the siting of the barn at this location, it was appropriately sited within the landscape subject to the submission of the Landscape Management Plan. Existing levels of privacy were not considered to be affected. With regard to the impact of traffic, the Highway Authority had no objections to the plans as submitted.



Notwithstanding the objections raised, on balance the development was considered justified and necessary to aid the running of the farm holding and it was considered that the impacts of the buildings upon the wider landscape could be mitigated against with appropriate landscaping conditions. The development therefore complied with the policies of the adopted Local Development Plan 2 and was recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

The first of two speakers was Louise Cunningham who was objecting to the application and highlighted the impact of the development both on her family as residents and their business, highlighting the noise of the machinery caused by the close proximity, poor siting and design of the shed. She considered both developments to be unsympathetically located opposite their camping site, on the brow of the hill and up wind of them, with the open side of the shed facing their direction meaning that they heard every sound, which echoed around the buildings. This particularly affected their guests sleeping under canvas. They had also been plagued by odour and flies since the development had taken place, and had suffered disturbance from shot guns and crow banners. The area was a popular tourist destination, with their campsite open all year, hosting children and dogs. With regard to farm traffic on the lane, it was noted that the farm machinery did not travel at 20mph, despite signs having been erected. Silage was brought to the farm from Marloes which was not considered to be sustainable and the site was used all year round, with trailers every 3-6 minutes during silage cutting. The access road was also a bridleway and public right of way leading to the coast path which she noted was not mentioned in the officers report, and this was dangerous as it was well used by locals and visitors alike.

Ms Cunningham also expressed concern regarding groundwater contamination due to the poor structural integrity of the runway on which the silage clamp was situated. She feared that this, together with runoff from the fields after heavy rain, would leach into the groundwater and cause a public health problem with the borehole which supplied their drinking water.

In summary, Ms Cunningham concluded that both the cowshed and silage clamp were having a detrimental impact on their lives and wellbeing, as well as that of their business, guests and the environment. They did not believe that planting would mitigate these impacts or the effect on biodiversity. She noted that 11 letters of objection had been written by their guests and asked that these be taken into consideration, as these visitors were in Pembrokeshire to enjoy its special qualities and tranquillity and to enjoy a low impact sustainable holiday, supporting the local economy. She cautioned that allowing a retrospective application



set a dangerous precedent and reminded Members of their primary duties to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park area and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the area by the public.

As a final matter, Ms Cunningham asked that the public health advisory notes in the officer's report be deleted as these were taken from a private email and were out of context, referring to a different application. The report also said that the development could not be seen from the farmhouse, which was inaccurate, as noted by the officer at a recent site visit.

The second speaker was Geraint John, the agent. He explained that the application was retrospective as his client had believed the development to be permitted development. Once it was identified that an application was required, this was promptly prepared, and there had been a lot of discussion with officers. He stated that one of the main purposes of the barn was for herd isolation due to TB. He noted that officers had assessed the evidence and advised that the principle of development was compatible with national and local policy. The Agricultural Advisor, having inspected the complex, had found the building to have a functional purpose and to be sited in a practical location. There was a sustainable re-use of land and NRW and other statutory consultees supported the siting of the development subject to landscaping. While he acknowledged there had been some neighbour objections to a perceived increase in agricultural traffic using the lane and to noise, he noted that there was no growth in the agricultural operation, the size of the herd remaining the same. He noted that the Highway Authority supported the application, stating that the lane had historically been used for farm access and to service the airfield. The use of the road had in fact been improved through the introduction of a voluntary 20mph speed limit and training of drivers to improve their awareness and to minimise disturbance. Public Protection had also found the plans to be compatible with what would be expected in an agricultural and countryside landscape. Officers had concluded that the separation distances were acceptable as was the proposed screening, and subject to conditions relating to biodiversity and land draining the application was recommended for approval and he urged Members to determine the application in accordance with this.

In response to questions from Members, Mr John replied that he was not aware that building regulations applied to the building as it was not habitable accommodation. NRW were responsible for water quality permitting and they were satisfied in that regard. Members expressed disappointment with the retrospective nature of the application, and Mr John explained that there had been a silage clamp at this location previously which was in the process of being upgraded, and there had



always been a yard and a complex of buildings at the site of the shed. Neither was a flagrant breach of planning laws. Members also asked whether an alternative route across the fields could be created for farm machinery. The agent replied that this option had not been explored but could be considered in future, however the Highway Authority was satisfied that the existing roadway could accommodate the traffic movements.

Members also had concerns regarding the location of the development away from other farm buildings, the sustainability of the planting in such an exposed location, compliance with appropriate building regulation and other certification and the noise impact. The officer replied that as a result of the noise concerns raised, the Public Protection Team at Pembrokeshire County Council had been consulted, however they had advised that this was typical of agricultural operations in the countryside and had not objected to the application. The Solicitor advised that Health and Safety and Building Regulations had their own enforcement regimes and these issues were not material to the planning application. There was also some discussion regarding the disposal of liquid waste from the shed, however the officer clarified that the plan should refer to a feed passage, not a scrape passage. The building would not be scraped out but that straw would absorb the waste and this would be disposed of appropriately, under regulations controlled by NRW.

It was proposed and seconded that a site inspection take place. The Administration and Democratic Services Manager reminded Members that the new Committee would undertake the visit and subsequently determine the application.

DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow the Committee to visit the site.

[Councillor M Evans tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture. The meeting was adjourned between 11.50am and 12.05pm]

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/21/0743/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr and Mr A & D Berry, Merry Bros
PROPOSAL: Proposed residential development of 15 dwellings
and associated works
LOCATION: Land adjacent to the Primary School, Trewarren Road,
St Ishmaels

It was reported that this was a major application which sought full planning permission for 15 dwellings at land adjacent to the school in St Ishmaels. The site lay within the Centre boundary of St. Ishmaels, a Rural Centre as defined by Local Development Plan (LDP) 2, and was allocated for 13 no. dwellings, which had outline consent, of which 3 were



affordable. The principle of development on this site was therefore established.

Two objections had been received, as outlined in the report, and these included a reduction in the affordable housing proposed, highway safety and lack of parking in relation to the school, sewerage capacity and flooding. It was reported at the meeting that a response had been received from the Community Council which objected to the application on road safety grounds and parking in relation to the school as well as sewage disposal.

This application proposed an increase of 2 no. dwellings to 15 dwellings, 4 of which were proposed to be affordable which was considered acceptable, in principle. The officer clarified at the meeting that 25% affordable housing was required, which equated to 3.75 units; in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Guidance this could have been rounded down, however the applicants had proposed 4 units.

Officers considered that the proposed 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. There were no overriding concerns in respect of residential amenity of the application site or the neighbouring properties.

With regard to Highway Safety and Access, the Highways Department of Pembrokeshire County Council had been consulted and had given a conditional approval response, stating that a financial contribution of £21,000 would be required to improve cycle facilities in St Ishmaels. The contribution would be secured via a S106 agreement.

Both Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and the Authority's Planning Ecologist had been consulted on the application. NRW had recommended conditions to provide a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a lighting condition which would be included. It had been reported that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) would be required prior to any potential approval being granted due to the potential for likely significant effects on the Special Area of Conservation, however it was reported at the meeting that this had now been undertaken by the Ecologist and approved by NRW. Additional conditions in respect of biodiversity enhancement had also been proposed, and these would need to be added should permission be granted. Also it was noted that the landscaping conditions set out in the report were incorrect.

Notwithstanding the objections raised, on balance the development was considered to comply with the adopted LDP and it was recommended that



the application be delegated for approval subject to appropriate conditions and the submission of a S106 agreement.

The first of two speakers was Sonja Groves, the Head Teacher of Coastlands School. She disagreed with the officer that the school would not be overlooked as although the school's main playground was away from the proposed development, there was an outdoor learning area for foundation and nursery pupils which was located to the rear, and she was concerned about safeguarding in respect of this, and also the disruption to the children's education from machinery, noise and dust during construction. Another concern was with the safety of the road, which was dangerous at present, with staff needing to be present to ensure the safety of children at the beginning and end of the school day. The road was narrow, with no pavements, and cars travelled too fast. She feared that an additional 30 cars in an estate next to the school would only exacerbate the problem. Also she was aware of the problems caused when parents parked in residential areas. Capacity of the sewerage system was also of concern as the main sewer crossed the front of the school and this overspilled during certain conditions. While welcoming growth which would sustain the village, Ms Groves stated that this should not be at the cost of the safety of children and parents. Concerns had also been expressed to her regarding the affordability of the development for those who lived and worked in the community, with the 2 bed affordable houses unlikely to meet the needs of local families. She invited Members to visit the site at the end of school day to see the situation for themselves.

The second speaker was Rob Davies, the agent. He explained that this was a longstanding housing allocation in the adopted Local Development Plan which had an extant permission for 13 dwellings. The principle of development was therefore established. The increase in density to 15 dwellings (20 dwellings per hectare) represented a better use of land. A high quality development was proposed, and officers considered it to be acceptable in character and appearance and not detrimental to the National Park. Privacy and amenity of existing dwellings would not be affected. The Highway Authority had no objections, subject to conditions and a financial contribution towards walking and cycling improvements through a S106 Agreement, which the applicants had agreed and welcomed. He noted that this provision – of a footway linking to the car park at the sports field – was not included in the extant scheme. The affordable housing proposed exceeded that required and would also be subject to a S106 agreement. Conditions were proposed in respect of arboricultural matters, ecological enhancement and mitigations including tree and hedgerow planting. The site was not in the flood zone and the proposals were considered to be acceptable by the drainage engineer, with Sustainable Drainage Approval Body (SAB) consent granted. Welsh



Water had identified no issue with capacity. The proposed development therefore accorded with the local development plan with no objections in the report from statutory consultees and it was therefore considered acceptable on balance. Mr Davies asked the Committee to endorse the officer recommendation and to approve the development subject to a S106 agreement.

Members asked the agent about the overlooking issues and parking problems raised by the school and he replied that as it was a narrow parcel of land it was difficult to envisage any other layout, however the plots were offset from the boundary, with reinforced landscaping and there was a 1.5 ecological buffer which would maximise the separation distance. When asked whether consideration had been given to locating the estate road on the western boundary, he added that much of the ecological value of the site was to the eastern boundary and a greater buffer could therefore be created. Also doing so would lead to amenity considerations regarding residential properties to the east - a balance therefore had to be struck.

With regarding to parking, he noted that planning permission for 13 dwellings already existed, and the Highway Authority had raised no objection. His client had agreed a £21,000 contribution to pavement improvements and cycle links which would not be secured should the original permission be implemented. He anticipated that the estate road would be adopted through a S38 Agreement. He also clarified that at this stage no Registered Social Landlord (RSL) was involved with the site, with the properties to be secured by S106 agreement and sold, but retained as affordable in perpetuity. He had not received any feedback from the Housing Strategy Manager that the unit types proposed were not acceptable, with the main need identified being for 1 bed accommodation. The Director of Planning and Park Direction advised that low cost home ownership, whereby house prices were capped at 70% of open market values and legally bound to remain affordable in perpetuity through a S106 Agreement, was acceptable as set out in the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Affordable Housing. Wording to ensure a local connection through cascade assessment would also be included.

A motion to visit the site was proposed and seconded and the vote carried. Members asked that the timing of the Site Visit could accord with either the start or end of the school day so that Members could see the traffic problems for themselves. Also that representatives from the Highway Authority and Welsh Water could be invited to the meeting.



The Solicitor pointed out that the applicant had a right of appeal if the application was not determined within the appropriate timescale, and no extension to this timescale had been agreed.

DECISION: That the application be deferred in order for a Site Inspection to take place.

[Councillor P Harries disclosed a prejudicial interest and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the following application]

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/22/0092
APPLICANT: Mr D Fitzwilliams
PROPOSAL: Construction of a new pair of wheelchair access lifts
LOCATION: Riverslea, Golf Course Road, Newport

It was reported that Riverslea was a large one and half storey detached dwelling located in an extensive plot situated on the northern shore of the Nyfer estuary. The property has a rear extension cut into the cliff face and the coastal path ran immediately behind at first floor level. The application was before the Committee due to an objection from Nevern Community Council contrary to the officer recommendation.

This application was for the addition of a pair of external wheelchair and disabled access lifts. The first to connect between the existing ground floor level of the house and rising up to the public footpath above. A second lift was proposed to reach the present car parking area. The proposed lifts would be made of clear plate glass and marine grade stainless steel. The structural concrete and masonry walls would be finished in either white painted render or natural western red cedar boarding. The upper structure of the top lift would also be constructed within a natural solid timber framed pergola structure, planted to provide evergreen climbing plant screening. This would screen the upper half of the lift installation from view when seen above the present ridge line of the house when viewed from across the estuary and from the coast path itself.

A lighting plan had been submitted with the application which specified the lighting deemed necessary for safe use of the two lifts, and this would be at low level. A condition requiring submission of the detail of which lights would be controlled by Passive Infrared (PIR) sensors was proposed, to ensure there was no unnecessary light pollution.

With regard to the impact on the public footpath (Coast Path), the Rights of Way Officer had advised that any temporary closure of the footpath had to be kept to a minimum and done in consultation with the National Park Authority. It was noted that the creation of a retaining wall to



accommodate the lower lift would entail excavating part of the rock face which supported the public footpath. Therefore a condition would require an assessment of the stability measures to be taken to be submitted prior to the commencement of works.

Officers considered that provided that a schedule of materials was conditioned to ensure there was no visible concrete blockwork, the use of timber cladding and landscaping should ensure that there was no lasting negative impact to the special qualities of the National Park. Ecological and landscape features would not be adversely affected by the development. It was therefore considered to comply with the policies of the adopted Local Development Plan and recommended for approval.

At the meeting, the officer requested some amendments to the proposed conditions to refer to an addition plan and to amend condition 4 to refer to external finishes. Following a question from a Member, a further condition was suggested to require details of the boundary treatment along the sides of the coast path, which would have the effect of preventing the general public gaining access to the lifts or lift shaft. Also that condition 8 be strengthened to refer to ongoing maintenance of the footpath in addition to work during its construction.

Members were concerned to ensure that the impact of the development on users of the coast path was minimised and their safety protected. They also agreed that control of lighting was necessary to prevent light spillage on the river and in views towards the property. Officers advised that these points would be dealt with by conditions.

DECISION: That the application be approved, subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, light mitigation strategy, external finishes, Construction Method Statement, landscaping scheme, boundary treatments and protection of the stability of the public footpath.

7. Appeals

The Acting 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.

Decisions were appended to the report in respect of NP/21/0236/FUL 4a Bryn Road, St Davids (dismissed) and NP/21/0404/ADV illuminated signage at Premier Inn, St Davids (partially allowed and partially dismissed).



A Member asked about progress in respect of the Trewern Appeal and was advised that a meeting had recently been held between Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and the Agent regarding the Habitats Regulations Assessment and additional information had been provided which NRW were now considering.

NOTED.

