

Development Management Committee

7 September 2022

Present (In Person)

Dr M Havard (Chair)

Councillor Steve Alderman, Councillor Mrs D Clements, Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Councillor R Jordan, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Councillor Mrs S Skyrme-Blackhall, Councillor Mrs M Wiggins and Councillor A Wilcox.

Present (Remotely)

Mrs S Hoss, Mrs J James, Dr RM Plummer and Councillor C Williams

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock and Virtually 10.00am – 11.20am;
11.30am - 1.00pm; 1.30pm – 3.10pm]

1. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Dr R Heath-Davies and Councillor Mrs V Thomas.

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
Minute 7 below – general declaration as an NRW Board Member and Plantlife Trustee	Dr R Plummer	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting on these applications
<i>Minute 7(f)below</i> NP/21/0720 14 Grove Place Little Haven	Councillor P Morgan	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting thereon
Minute 8 below Enforcement EC19/0007 – Pool House, Hasguard Cross	Councillor P Morgan Councillor Dr S Hancock	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed



3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 20 July 2022 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was noted that page 15 of the minutes stated that “references to past or future flooding of the building were no longer considered to be relevant”. As future flooding of a building was of considerable relevance, it was asked that “or future” be deleted.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 20 July 2022 be confirmed and signed subject to the above amendment.

4. Matters Arising

a) NP/21/0673/S73 (Minute 7(d))

Members noted that following the last meeting, several of them had received calls and emails from residents in respect of this application as the report had inferred that discussions and negotiations had taken place with them, however this was not the case and they felt that they had been misrepresented. Officers were asked to check with third parties in future that appropriate conversations had taken place.

b) Good Wishes (Minute 9)

Following the Departure of the Director, the Chief Executive reported that interviews had taken place, and Ms Sara Morris had been appointed to the position. It was hoped that she would take up the post in early November. He added that in the meantime, additional cover was being provided by Alan Southerby who was working 2 days per week.

NOTED.

5. 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/22/0104/FUL	Alterations and extensions to public house including the	Kathryn Perkins – on behalf of



<i>Minute 7(a) refers</i>	provision of 3no. proposed bed & breakfast units, internal alterations to Managers' Accommodation at first floor and conversion of existing external store to bike maintenance workshop – Milton Brewery, Milton	Applicant (in person)
NP/21/0614/FUL <i>Minute 7(c) refers</i>	Subdivide the existing plot to provide a new 4 bed, 1 & ½ storey dwelling with associated external works and shared vehicle access - Oratava, Manorbier	Anna Knibb – Objector (in person) Phil Kidney – (in person) Oliver Cooper on behalf of applicant (in person)
NP/22/0083/FUL <i>Minute 7(d) refers</i>	One Planet Development including house and polytunnels – Land formerly part of Penrallt, Velindre, Crymych	Jessica Seaton – supporter (in person) Cllr Richard George - Community Council (virtually) Mr Jonathan Tiller – Applicant (in person)
NP/22/0192/FUL <i>Minute 7(e) Refers</i>	Replacement building – Penlan Farm, Moylegrove, Cardigan	Cllr Richard George - Community Council (virtually)
NP/21/0720/FUL <i>Minute 7(f) refers</i>	Demolition of existing garage and division of rear garden to provide a plot for a new three-bedroom dwelling – Manor House, 14 Grove Place, Little Haven	Mr Michael Hughes – Applicant (in person)
NP/22/0294/FUL <i>Minute 7(i) refers</i>	Alterations and improvements to existing dwelling together with conversion of existing boat store into artist studio for	Cllr Richard George – Community Council (virtually)



continued ancillary use,
together with the erection of
new garden shed to replace
the existing large oil tank – Y
Fagal, Moylegrove,
Cardigan

It was also noted that Members had received correspondence on a number of the applications. Officers would accept additional relevant information until the commencement of the Committee and this would be reported at the appropriate time, however Members could only make decisions on the information available to them.

6. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

Tomos Phillips from Geldards explained that he was attending the meeting that day in place of Charles Felgate who was on leave. 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

7. 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*):



- (a) REFERENCE: NP/22/0104/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr A Trollope Bellew
PROPOSAL: Alterations and extensions to public house including the provision of 3no. proposed bed & breakfast units, internal alterations to Managers' Accommodation at first floor and conversion of existing external store to bike maintenance workshop
LOCATION: Milton Brewery, Milton, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 8PH

Members were reminded that this application was before the Committee having been considered at the previous meeting when they were minded to approve it contrary to the officer recommendation. The 'Cooling Off' Procedure was subsequently invoked by the Director of Planning and Park Direction and the application was now being brought back to Committee for further consideration.

It was reported that the property lay within a C2 flood zone as shown on the Natural Resources Wales Development Advice Maps. Policy 34 stated that development would be directed away from those areas which were at risk of flooding now or as predicted for the future by TAN 15 Development Advice Maps unless there were sound social or economic justifications in accordance with the advice set out in TAN 15. Such justifications included being part of a local authority regeneration initiative or strategy or being necessary to contribute to key employment objectives to sustain a region. Officers considered that these tests did not apply in this instance.

Whilst there was already existing residential use on the first floor by way of Managers accommodation, this proposal sought to significantly increase the on-site accommodation by providing 3 no. bed and breakfast units. In addition, the flood zone extended to surround the property which would have an impact on potential means of escape or access for emergency services in the event of a flood. As such, the proposal was contrary to TAN 15 and Policy 34 and although, following the submission of amended plans, the application was now acceptable in design terms, the recommendation remained one of refusal.

It was noted that should Members be minded to approve the application, conditions in respect of lighting and occupancy as holiday accommodation only were suggested.

One Member asked whether there were any accesses to the property that were not within the flood zone, and the officer replied that he believed that only the proposed side elevation was not within it. The Member noted that even if the entire property was in the flood zone, the projected depth of flooding was of half a wellington, which he did not consider to be a



huge risk. The Development Management Team Leader replied that 0.4m of water was sufficient to sweep someone off their feet and in such conditions, the emergency services would not know if a manhole cover was missing and could themselves be put in danger.

There was one speaker on this application, Kathryn Perkins, who was speaking as managing agents for the property. She clarified that the property had two front doors, one of which was not in the flood zone and this could be accessed by the internal staircase. She noted that the application proposed a bike workshop, ground floor alterations to the bar and bed and breakfast accommodation at first floor level, and that a similar scheme had been successfully implemented at the nearby Carew Inn which was also in the same ownership. Noting that the only ground for refusal related to location of the property within the C2 Flood Zone, with the application therefore contrary to Policy 34 and TAN 15 Development and Flood Risk, Ms Perkins explained that a flood risk assessment had been undertaken by Ashfield and this outlined some mitigating factors including registration for Natural Resources Wales (NRW) Flood Warning and preparation of a Business Flood Plan; the risk of tidal flooding was the dominant factor and this was considered to be more predictable. NRW had reviewed the assessment and were satisfied that the risk and consequences of flooding were manageable to an acceptable level. She also considered that the proposal met the criteria set out in Policy 43 regarding employment sites, because it was previously developed land, and as the only public house in the village its redevelopment would bring new life to a building in need of refurbishment and safeguard employment. She felt that the fact that this employment was not provided by a local authority was inequitable. The development would not increase flooding or redirect water and had a reduced footprint.

One Member asked what the expected increase in employment would be, and whether the bed and breakfast accommodation would be open all year. Ms Perkins replied that the existing tenant intended to remain and would operate all year round; it was anticipated that two additional full-time employees would be recruited, in addition to part time staff.

A motion to approve the application was proposed and seconded, with community and economic benefit given as the grounds for doing so. Another Member noted that public houses would struggle in the current financial climate and encouragement should be given to that trade. It was also noted that the application would bring a run-down property back to life and this was to be commended. It was suggested that an additional condition be included requiring registration with the NRW Flood Warning system and provision of a business flood plan, and that this should be given to guests, in addition to details of spring tides. Those who had proposed and seconded the motion agreed to inclusion of such a



condition, although the Development Management Team Leader noted that officers couldn't comment on the adequacy of such a Plan.

Other Members, while sympathetic to the points made, noted that extreme weather conditions were now being experienced on a routine basis and that flooding could occur at night and when it was unexpected. They also argued that Members had to think about the likely risk of flooding in the future, not just the current risk. They considered that the Committee should follow the policies set out.

As this application had been subject to the Authority's 'Cooling Off' Procedure, a recorded vote was taken for approval of the application, subject to conditions:

For – Councillor S Alderman, Councillor Mrs D Clements, Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Mrs S Hoss, Mrs J James, Councillor R Jordan, Mr GA Jones, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Councillor Mrs S Skyrme-Blackhall, Councillor Mrs M Wiggins, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor C Williams.

Against - Councillor M James, Dr M Havard and Dr RM Plummer

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the application, accordance with plans and documents, lighting, occupancy as holiday accommodation only, registration of the manager with NRW's flood warning system and provision of a flood management plan to be displayed in the rooms for guests.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/22/0193/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr O Blakiston
PROPOSAL: Proposed Renovation and Extension of existing restaurant and flat at Anchor House
LOCATION: 13, Main Street, Solva, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6UU

It was reported that Anchor House formed part of the historic core of Solva, being part of the ribbon of houses on the western side of the valley between the main road (to the west) and the river (to the east). The application sought approval for the demolition of an existing single storey rear extension as well as the erection of a new ground floor flat-roofed extension to the rear of the property. In addition, the scheme proposed the upgrade of the existing rear seating area through the creation of new block paving to the patio areas on a hardcore (porous) base. Internally the new extension would provide for an enlarged kitchen area and a new dining room, welfare facilities were to be moved to the southern portion of



the new extension (thereby improving internal circulation) adjacent to the expanded kitchen area.

The proposal was considered acceptable in terms of its overall design and would preserve the character of the Conservation Area. The site layout was not considered to lead to any negative impact on adjoining properties, however a consultation response from Public Protection had highlighted a potential issue with regard to the extraction flues proposed. Also the Tree and Landscape Officer had advised he would require further detail in respect of landscaping, however these two issues had not been further explored with the applicant as more fundamental issues with regard to flooding had been identified.

The site was located within a C2 flood zone and also within a designated coastal change management area. Whilst the general strategy was to direct development away from such areas, Policy 35 advised that applications for the intensification of existing uses within such zones were required to demonstrate "that it will result in no increased risk to life or significant increase in risk to property, in addition to complying with all other relevant policies of the Local Development Plan."

In this instance the applicant noted and accepted the potential risks of development in this location and appropriate mitigation was proposed through the Flood Consequences Assessment to address these matters. They had noted that additionally, the proposal (classified as less vulnerable development) would clearly contribute to the continued economic and social viability of Solva (and by implication the wider plan area) thereby contributing to the other criteria of policies 34/35.

Officers considered that whilst some detail had been provided that sought to give certain levels of assurance that any risk within the flood zone had been qualified, and appropriate measures taken to mitigate any identified risk, this had not robustly demonstrated the case such that the provisions of Policy 35 had been met and complied with. It was considered that the applicant had not adequately demonstrated that the proposal would result in no increased risk to property and as such there was a clear policy objection to the proposal. Bearing in mind the premise within legislation that determinations were to be made in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless other material circumstances indicated otherwise, the recommendation was to refuse the application.

It was noted at the meeting that further correspondence had been received in respect of this application and this had been circulated to the Committee.



Members sought clarification regarding Natural Resources Wales' (NRW) response of no objection and officers replied that NRW were content that the risks – in this case a risk to property, rather than to life – could be managed. However, the Authority's policy, which sought to prevent intensification of uses in areas at risk, was in line with Welsh Government policy. Other Members agreed with that position, noting that flooding placed a call upon the emergency services which could be placed in danger, and that the risk of flooding was likely to increase over time.

Other Members, however, noted that most of Lower Solva was within the C2 Flood Zone and Coastal Change Management Area, yet this was an area that was popular with visitors. They considered that preventing any further development in that area made no sense, and that if people and businesses understood the risks and were willing to spend their own money to better the area, they should be allowed to do so, as it was clear that the buildings under consideration were in need of attention. While it was acknowledged that future flooding events could destroy Lower Solva, Members considered that the best should be made of it for the time available. A motion to approve the application for economic reasons was moved and seconded.

The Development Management Team Leader advised that if Members were minded to approve the application, having consulted with colleagues and the Chief Executive, she would not invoke the 'Cooling Off' Procedure as even though such a decision was clearly against policy, in this instance there was no risk to life. However, she requested that any approval be delegated to officers to allow the issues regarding the flue and the trees to be addressed, and a list of additional conditions which officers would recommend should also be included were provided. Those Members who had proposed and seconded the proposal agreed to amend their motion to delegate approval subject to conditions.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the provision of additional details in respect of the extraction flue and trees on the site, and subject to conditions in respect of timing of the application, accordance with plans, noise, landscaping and the flats to be used as staff accommodation only.

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



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/21/0614/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr S Callow
PROPOSAL: Subdivide the existing plot to provide a new 4 bed, 1 & ½ storey dwelling with associated external works and shared vehicle access.
LOCATION: Oratava, Manorbier, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7TE

It was reported that this application had been considered at the June meeting of the Committee when it was resolved to undertake a site visit, which took place on 4th July 2022. The application had been due to be reported to the next Committee on the 20th July but had been deferred due to neighbour concerns over notification. These had now been double checked and the application could be considered accordingly.

The application was before the Development Management Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the views of Manorbier Community Council. Several letters of objection had also been received and these were outlined and addressed within the report. It was reported at the meeting that since writing the report, additional objections had been received in respect of the accuracy of the drawing submitted, the overbearing nature of the development, privacy, light pollution, loss of amenity, access and concerns regarding the nearby Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). These had been considered by officers, however their recommendation was unchanged.

The application site formed part of an existing residential amenity area associated with the host dwelling known as Oratava. The plot would share the existing main access and was located on the western part of the site which was gently sloping when compared to most of the remaining site which was steeply sloping. It was within the Centre boundary for Manorbier, as defined in LDP2, and the principle of developing the site for residential use was accordingly acceptable. It was also considered that the development would have no adverse harm upon visual amenity, character and wider amenities of the area, including on the Conservation Area and Manorbier Castle which was a SAM.

The Highway Authority had indicated that the lane leading to the host site and farmland beyond was a private (not an adopted) road although there were footpath rights along it. They had advised that there were issues because of the width of the lane between the old stone walls, and the lane was considered as very close to capacity in terms of vehicle traffic and certainly further extensions of the development limits (beyond this application) would need to be resisted.



Following careful consideration of the application and its merits it was concluded that the proposed scheme represented an appropriate form of development in this location. The development by reason of its siting and design would preserve and not harm the special qualities of the National Park and the Manorbier Conservation Area. The proposal was also considered to be compatible with the strategic aims of conserving or enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park, and the public understanding and enjoyment of those qualities. The recommendation was one of approval, subject to appropriate conditions.

The first of three speakers was Anna Knib, who had three minutes to speak as she had addressed the Committee on a previous occasion. She explained that she was representing neighbours and residents of Manorbier and stated that she did not believe that accurate plans were available which showed the size and height of the proposed dwelling in relation to neighbouring properties, and therefore the overbearing impact of the proposals as well as separation distances could not be accurately judged. She also considered that a plan showing levels of the proposed dwelling in relation to existing properties would give greater clarity, as she believed that the roofline of the property would be visible from the church, beach, castle and coast path. Ms Knib pointed out that the Highway Authority considered the lane was close to capacity and stated that they were unaware that it already served 3 entrances. Land drainage was also a concern as the site was in excess of a metre above the neighbouring property and trees and shrubbery had been removed from it; as a result there were also fears for the stability of the medieval boundary wall. In addition, the soil was believed to be clay in the area set aside for Sustainable Drainage (SUDS) and there was felt to be inadequate room for both SUDS and a septic tank. The proposals were considered to be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties and officers had given no consideration to their right to light. The Dormer window would look directly into the windows of the neighbouring property resulting in a loss of privacy and possible light pollution. She concluded by stating that residents considered the proposals to be in contravention of Policy 30 and would have an adverse effect on amenity.

The second speaker was County Councillor Phil Kidney who was speaking on behalf of residents and the Community Council (CC) in objecting to the application. He advised that the Community Council felt that the development was too big for this area of the village and would not help the wellbeing of the community. He considered it to be an imposing building which would dominate the skyline in views from the coast path, beach and castle, and not enhance the area, contrary to one of the key principles of the National Park. Although there had been no objection from the Highway Authority, they had stated that the lane was nearing capacity; he believed that it was dangerous, already at capacity, and that



Members would have noted how narrow it was when they visited the site. Councillor Kidney added that Manorbier CC diligently considered every application and were open to development within the village, however they did not consider this overbearing building to be right for the area, having sympathy with those in neighbouring properties who would have to live with it. He stated that he, like the CC, cared passionately about the village, and he asked the Committee to help the residents and the community by refusing the application.

One Member pointed out to Councillor Kidney that he had referred to the proposed development generating a “terrific amount of traffic” and queried what the basis of that statement was. Councillor Kidney stated that it would at least generate more traffic, as it was likely that the occupants of the proposed property would have 2 to 3 cars. Councillor Kidney also stated that the community would look more sympathetically at development on a smaller scale.

The final speaker was Oliver Cooper, the agent, who also had 3 minutes having spoken on the application previously. He noted that Members would have seen the spacious nature of the plot and believed that the development made efficient use of land within the settlement boundary of Manorbier. He pointed out that officers considered the principle of residential use at this location to be acceptable, and this was further evidenced by the fact that the land had previously benefitted from planning permission for a dwelling. In terms of its design, and the impact of the proposals, he noted that both the Planning and Building Conservation Officers were in support of the application, considering that the traditional design and cottage scale would preserve the Conservation Area. Turning to the objections that had been received by the Authority, Mr Cooper believed that the development was appropriate for the site and context, which consisted of a mix of storey heights, and noted that the house covered only 15% of the plot. He believed that concerns of overlooking and amenity had been comprehensively addressed by the orientation and positioning of the windows and the sectional drawing had provided topographical levels. Further to this he noted that the rear Velux windows in the neighbouring property were frosted which would eliminate any views into the proposed dwelling. A comprehensive landscaping scheme was proposed along the south-western boundary which would help screen the development in wider views; only one tree would be lost and seven planted, which represented an ecological enhancement. He also noted that the development was acceptable in terms of heritage, with support from Cadw, landscaping, biodiversity, flood risk and drainage. With regard to the latter, the ground was of laminate rock which was an acceptable material and this would in any case be considered as part of the SAB (Sustainable Drainage) application. Finally, the application would make a significant contribution to affordable housing, which Mr



Cooper believed was to be welcomed when there were over 5,000 people on the housing list.

In answer to Members' question regarding the septic tank, Mr Cooper confirmed that it would be for the sole use of the proposed property. In response to a question about the possibility of installing a land drain, he advised that a drainage engineer would be commissioned to advise regarding sustainable drainage. The officer confirmed that the SAB legislation should ensure there was no runoff from the site.

Members acknowledged that the access to the site was difficult, and expressed disappointment with the Highway Authority, suggesting that a meeting be arranged with them at some point in future to discuss highway matters more generally. Some Members agreed with Manorbier Community Council that the property was too high and overbearing for the piece of land, however others acknowledged that while a smaller property might have been preferable, they had to consider the application before them. It was suggested that a construction management plan would be helpful to manage traffic and a motion to approve the application subject to that, and other conditions as set out in the report, was proposed and seconded. This was won on the Chair's casting vote.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of the application, accordance with plans and documents, biodiversity enhancement, lighting, parking, removal of permitted development rights, undergrounding of cables and submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/22/0083/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr and Mrs J & S Tiller
PROPOSAL: One Planet Development including house and polytunnels
LOCATION: Land formerly part of Penrallt, Velindre, Crymych, Pembrokeshire, SA41 3XW

It was reported that this application had been brought to Committee as the Community Council had objected to it, contrary to the views of officers. At the time of the report being written, there had been 4 letters of support and 14 letters of objection or concern and these were outlined.

The proposal was for a One Planet Development (OPD) within a single field located less than 1 mile from the village of Nevern, but outside any Centre boundaries as defined by the Local Development Plan 2 and was therefore classified as Countryside where development had to be strictly controlled. The site was surrounded on all sides by woodland and thick hedgerow.



The land subject to the application had been purchased in June 2020 and now included an existing diversified agroforestry business. There were two existing polytunnels and a free-standing PV solar arrange associated with the business on the site, granted prior approval by the Development Management Committee in January 2021. There was also an existing borehole.

The report considered that the applicant had addressed the main principles of One Planet Development Policy set nationally by Welsh Government and following an assessment and the submission of additional information / clarification from the applicant it was considered that there was a reasonable prospect that all the various objectives of the policy would be met.

In terms of other planning considerations, it was considered that the dwelling had been sited to minimise any visual impact and would benefit from the high screening of the vegetation on three sides. Increased planting was also proposed that would further improve the winter cover over a period of five years. Its location was relatively isolated, and it was not considered that the proposed dwelling or operation of an OPD would cause a significant adverse impact upon the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties.

Many of the representations had raised concerns with regards to the proposed polytunnels. It was relevant to consider that two of the four polytunnels shown on the proposed plans were existing. The third polytunnel had been proposed adjacent to an existing polytunnel (to the east) and a fourth, netted tunnel would be directly to the south. It was also pointed out that the barn shown on the plans as adjoining the house had previously been approved. It was considered that in the context of the existing polytunnels and a line of existing trees to the west, the proposed polytunnels would not have an adverse impact on the wider special qualities of the National Park.

The applicant had submitted a draft Section 106 agreement with the application and was aware that this would need to be completed, if planning permission was granted, to tie the dwelling to the land, secure landscaping proposals and include a commitment that the dwelling would be the sole residence of the occupants.

In conclusion, then, it was considered that the development would not cause an unacceptable or detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park and included various proposals to improve the site's environment and biodiversity and to protect existing trees and hedgebanks. The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the



living conditions of any nearby residents and would not result in any unacceptable impacts on highway safety. As such, the proposal complied with policies of the adopted Local Development Plan 2 2020 and could be supported. The recommendation sought delegated powers to approve it subject to the submission of a completed legal agreement to tie the dwelling to the land, secure all landscaping proposals, a commitment that the dwelling would be the sole residence of the occupants and the exit strategy in the event that the essential criteria were not met, and with the addition of conditions as set out in the report. The officer noted that the report should also have sought power to refuse the application if the S106 Agreement was not completed within three months of the meeting.

The DM Team Leader advised that further letters of objection and support had been received since the report had been written, however no new issues had been raised. A response had also been received from PCC Drainage Engineers providing no objection, but advising that SAB (Sustainable Drainage) consent would be required. Members asked a number of questions regarding the principles behind One Planet Developments, and it was suggested that this subject could usefully be covered in a Members' Workshop.

The first of three speakers was Jessica Seaton, who explained that she and her husband had run two companies in Wales, employing 250 people, had served on a number of Boards and had restored a Grade 2 listed farmhouse adjacent to the application site. They had looked at the application both as neighbours and as business people, and were supporting it. She had found the applicants to be well read, compassionate and energetic and she commended their courage and commitment for leaving a well remunerated career for a more sustainable lifestyle. She noted that Jonathan had taken time to consult with his neighbours and had always been considerate and keen to help with any concerns; she wanted to support a young family who worked hard on the land.

Ms Seaton said that she was interested to see how OPDs were aligned with key policies nationally in Wales regarding the climate and well-being, and with other National Park policies, but also believed that the initiative might ameliorate two more local issues – those of an aging population, and the exodus of young families who could not afford premium house prices and the similarly ageing demography of farmers and high financial barrier to entry into that sector.

She said that they cared very much for their local environment, especially given the important historical nature of their home, and would not support a development which threatened the calm or special qualities of the National Park or of Nevern in particular. She believed that the applicants



had gone to great lengths to ensure that their development was sited sensitively, and believed that the improvements in biodiversity proposed would benefit the many species of bat which could be found at her property.

Noting that sustainable development was a primary strategic objective of the National Park Authority and an important requirement of Welsh Government (WG)'s recent remit letter, she considered that applications such as this were an important step in meeting these objectives. She also respected the applicants' business model, with a need for trees as part of WG's National Forest proposal. She believed that it was important to raise trees locally, noting that importing trees led to lost income and the potential to bring in diseases.

She concluded that she believed this application should be approved as it provided economic and environmental benefits as well as supporting inspiring and capable people.

The second speaker was Richard George, speaking on behalf of Nevern and Moylegrove Community Council (CC). He stated that the CC would have preferred the development to look more like a smallholding, rather than being spread across the field. They also considered that as OPDs were a Welsh Government policy, the National Park had little control over them; in a meeting with representatives of the National Park some months previously, the CC had been informed that of the 41 OPDs in Wales, 6 were in Nevern and Moylegrove and he was concerned that some of the business plans were over-optimistic, were able to be revised, and were all trying to supply goods to the same local population. He stated that a cynical person could conclude that this was a backdoor way of getting accommodation in what was a precious area, but one where house prices were over £800,000 on average. He concluded by saying that the Community didn't want the area to become a ghetto of polytunnels.

The final speaker was Mr Jonathan Tiller, the applicant. He explained that he had worked closely with the Authority and was pleased that the recommendation was one of approval. He stated that their personal effort was aligned with the OPD policy and they had already committed significant time and energy to do this. The Management Plan submitted had been reviewed by an independent expert who had confirmed it met the policy requirements, including increasing biodiversity, conserving, managing and enhancing the environment, and would also increase the natural landscape features on the land. The independent report had concluded that there was a strong prospect that the proposal would meet OPD criteria within the required timescales.



Mr Tiller explained that they felt the application would help the National Park become more diverse with appropriate afforestation and habitat creation alongside food production and would also help in a small way to support the Authority become an exemplar in responding to the climate emergency. He added that there had been no objections from statutory consultees other than the Community Council.

He also noted that ensuring the development fitted sensitively within the landscape had been a key concern and they had commissioned a full landscape visual impact assessment and had also incorporated advice from officers, for example in respect of the roof colour, and he believed that this collaborative approach would allow the dwelling to assimilate into the landscape. Although they acknowledged the views of the CC, and noted that the dwelling was sited adjacent to the existing barn, they felt that moving either the polytunnels or the dwelling would lead to a greater impact on the landscape, a view with which officers had concurred.

He went on to explain that the land based business was based on growing trees with local provenance, of which there was a huge deficit in availability. He had received a WG Grant and the business had been described as an exemplar, using no chemicals, a peat-free growing medium, its own water supply and solar power, which would mean that it would have a lower carbon footprint than industry norms. It would soon become a Woodland Trust UK and Ireland Sourced and Grown Assurance Scheme (UKISG) accredited supplier. Strong relationships had been built with other businesses in the area which would boost local resilience and allow the business to meet 100% of their basic minimum needs based on the principles of fair work and sustainability and it would contribute towards a stronger greener economy. He also believed it would support sustainable farming in the area through the provision of trees which would go on to become key features of the landscape themselves.

Mr Tiller concluded by saying that both he and his wife had had numerous charitable and volunteering roles as they believed in giving back to the community where they lived. Having both been brought up in Pembrokeshire, they wished to continue to live here, but in a way that enhanced and preserved its special qualities. He asked Members to endorse the recommendation of approval and to support a young Pembrokeshire family who had a passion to build a sustainable life here.

Members asked a few questions in respect of the construction of the dwelling, sources of seed, nature of the trees and the sales of produce from the land, and Mr Tiller advised that the house was active solar and contained no concrete. The seed would come from the local seed region which provided trees with the right local genetics; they were cell grown



which was superior to bare rooted and could be packed tightly into pallets meaning there would be a minimal need for transport movements from the site. Also the produce grown was only for their own consumption, with the business providing the income needed for Council Tax etc.

Most Members considered the application to be well constructed and wished the applicants every success with the venture. The recommendation of delegated approval was moved and seconded

DECISION: That the application be delegated for approval subject to submission of a completed S106 Agreement within 3 months and subject to conditions in respect of the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents including the Management Plan, annual monitoring, landscaping, lighting, removal of Permitted Development rights, tree method statement and access gates.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch between 1.00pm and 1.30pm]

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/22/0192/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Collins
PROPOSAL: Replacement building
LOCATION: Penlan Farm, Moylegrove, Cardigan, Pembrokeshire, SA43 3BS

It was reported that Penlan was a former farm, comprising of a farmhouse and a number of outbuildings within the residential curtilage of the property. The proposed development included the demolition of an existing L-shaped disused milking parlour and covered area and replacement with a pitched roof double garage with garden store and office. The replacement building would be situated to the south of the footprint of the existing building, to use the natural gradient of the land and reduce the visibility from the road.

The application was before the Development Management Committee due to the objection raised by Nevern Community Council differing from the Officer's recommendation.

Officers considered the proposed scheme 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, neither 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 and could be supported.



It was noted at the meeting that a consultation response on this application was awaited from Cadw and therefore the recommendation was amended to that of delegated approval subject to Cadw's response. Having regard for the comments of the Community Council, a condition was recommended to ensure that the building was only used on an incidental basis to the main dwelling and to prevent any use or occupation independent of the main dwelling.

Mr Richard George then addressed the Committee on behalf of the Community Council. He noted that the shed was not on the same base as the original shed, and questioned why there was a need for garages and a garden shed when he understood there was no family living on the site. He stated that the annexe to the farmhouse was already rented out and a hardstanding and electric hookups for caravans had been installed apparently without planning permission. Councillors had been reliably informed that the shed would be used as accommodation in future and he therefore hoped that the condition proposed by officers would be sufficient to prevent this. The Community Council was very concerned about this potential misuse of the planning system. Mr George stated that he had understood that the area around Moylegrove and Ceibwr Bay would be granted a special status by the National Park to thwart development in this unspoilt area, however he noted that there seemed to have been an acceleration of development in the area in recent months and he believed that the Authority had forgotten the purposes of the National Park.

One Member noted that the Authority was under an obligation to reduce light spillage, and she was therefore surprised that there were no lighting conditions attached to the recommendation. Equally in respect of biodiversity net gains, she would have expected a scheme of enhancements to form a further condition. Officers replied that lighting and landscaping conditions could be added, but bird and bat boxes were already proposed as part of condition 4. With regard to the occupancy condition, the Solicitor clarified that the building could be used for residential purposes ancillary to the main dwelling e.g. as an extra bedroom, but not as an independent unit of accommodation.

Another Member asked how demolition of the existing building would be undertaken, and the officer advised that a demolition and restoration plan, to include landscaping, could be sought under a further condition.

A motion to delegate approval to officers subject to a positive response from Cadw and conditions as set out in the report and as discussed at the meeting, was moved and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to grant



permission subject to a positive response from Cadw, and subject to conditions in respect of timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, occupancy, ecology, lighting and submission of a demolition and restoration plan.

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/21/0720/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Hughes
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing garage and division of rear garden to provide a plot for a new three-bedroom dwelling
LOCATION: Manor House, 14 Grove Place, Little Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3UG

It was reported that the application site formed part of the rear garden of the host dwelling Manor House which was a Grade II Listed Building and also set within the Little Haven Conservation Area. The application site was currently occupied by a double garage serving the host property which had direct access onto Wesley Road.

This application was presented to the Development Management Committee due to the recommendation of the Officer differing from that of the Community Council. Three other responses had been received and these were summarised and addressed in the report.

The application site was within the Rural Centre of Little Haven and the principle of development was supported. The proposal was for a 3-bedroom dwelling, and the site had a current extant outline permission approving the principle of a 4 bedroom dwelling, which was a significant material consideration. The siting was considered to be acceptable as the proposal had a scale, form, mass and design which was considered to be in-keeping within this area of the National Park. There would be no significant impact upon the amenity and privacy of neighbouring properties and there would be no harm to highway safety.

The Building Conservation Officer had advised that the proposal would preserve the setting of the listed building to an acceptable degree and considered its siting within the Conservation Area would allow for retention of the views of the hillside beyond.

Conditions were suggested in respect of landscaping, biodiversity and land drainage, and Dyfed Archaeological Trust had indicated that in order to protect potential archaeological interests a Grampian style condition would need to be imposed to secure a written scheme of investigation.

The development was therefore considered to be appropriate and could be supported, subject to a schedule of suitable conditions as set out in the



report and the submitted legal agreement in respect of a financial contribution to affordable housing.

There was one speaker, the applicant, Mr Michael Hughes and he advised that he was attending only to answer any questions or allay any fears as he had been unable to attend the Community Council meeting when the application was considered by them as he had Covid. One Member asked about the process of demolition of the garages as this would lead to a lot of dust and traffic movements. Mr Hughes replied that this was something they were aware of as they wished to get on well with their neighbours. He assured the Committee that the builders would be responsible and the resulting development would enhance the area.

One Member noted that this application, like many designs considered by the Committee, had an excess of glass, and she was concerned about light spillage, and the effect of this on sea birds and biodiversity. She believed that this was a point of design the Authority was failing on and she welcomed clear conditions on this matter. The officer advised that in the case of this application, the glazed elevation looked into a high bank and therefore the elevation would not be visible and there would be no light spill.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to completion of a S106 Agreement within three months of the meeting, and conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, parking, protection of trees, landscaping, biodiversity enhancement scheme, lighting, surface water/drainage and archaeology.

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/22/0222/RES
APPLICANT: Mr D Madge
PROPOSAL: Access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale
LOCATION: Land off Nun Street and East of Ysgol Dewi, St Davids, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6NU

Members were reminded that outline planning permission with all matters reserved had been granted for the construction of 11 residential units in total with 10 no. full market dwellings and 1 no. affordable dwelling, reference NP/18/0488/OUT, by the Committee in December 2018. The site, which currently comprised two agricultural fields, represented an allocated site within the Local Development Plan 1.

A Reserved Matters application had been submitted showing the development as being accessed from Nun Street. House types were predominantly four bedroomed dwellings, with a semi-detached unit providing a 3 bed house and two x 1 bed flats at ground and first floor



level in the adjoining element. A detailed landscaping scheme was provided.

Four letters of objection had been received and these were summarised and considered within the report.

It was noted that the outline planning permission had been the subject of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, and the granting of the Reserved Matters approval fell within the ambit of the agreement such that it remained material and in force.

One member queried whether two affordable housing units should be secured on the site rather than one. Officers explained that the outline planning application had been approved before the Local Development Plan 2 had been adopted and so the policies of the previous Local Development Plan applied.

Officers considered that the reserved matters application largely followed the outline planning permission granted for the site. Details submitted of the access, scale, layout, appearance and landscaping of the scheme were considered to be acceptable. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with the Local Development Plan 2 and the recommendation was one of approval.

It was noted at the meeting that additional information had been received from the agent, and this had been circulated to the Committee. Members said that they liked the more traditional design of the proposed dwellings and the recommendation of approval was moved and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, roads, parking and turning, arboricultural details, landscaping, archaeology, ecology and lighting.

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/22/0096/FUL
APPLICANT: Mrs G Griffin
PROPOSAL: Proposed one bedroom owner/managers accommodation above cafe
LOCATION: Beach House Cafe, Gas Lane, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 8AG

It was reported that this application was for the raising of the roof of the existing café and the addition of a small two storey side extension to allow for a one bedroom managers flat to be created. The height would be increased by 2.2m to 1.5 storey and materials would match those as existing. It was noted that approval, now lapsed, had previously been



granted for a similar development and this was material to the determination of this application.

The application was before the Committee as Tenby Town Council had recommended refusal, contrary to the officer's recommendation. Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall advised the Committee that she did not vote on applications considered by Tenby Town Council.

The application site was located within the Centre boundary for Tenby, therefore the principle of creating living accommodation was acceptable in principle. Although the proposed manager's accommodation would be a new dwelling, the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing stated that managers dwellings would be exempt from providing a contribution to affordable housing providing its use was controlled through an appropriate planning condition.

Officers considered that the proposed extension was of a simple, modest design and scale with parking area. The proposal was considered to be appropriate in design, would offer no amenity issues to neighbouring properties and, subject to conditions restricting its use to tie it to the business, tree protection issues and highways matters, the recommendation was one of approval.

It was reported at the meeting that additional information had been received from the applicant and this had been circulated to the Committee.

Some Members noted that the building was not currently in use and had struggled with viability at various points in its history; they agreed with the concerns of the Town Council that the building could in time become residential. Officers agreed to look at the wording of the condition to ensure that it could only be lived in by someone actively employed in the café business and sought delegated powers to approve the application once this had been agreed.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve the application subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, external finishes, occupancy and parking.



- (i) REFERENCE: NP/22/0294/FUL
APPLICANT: Ms N Fife
PROPOSAL: Alterations and improvements to existing dwelling together with conversion of existing boat store into artist studio for continued ancillary use, together with the erection of new garden shed to replace the existing large oil tank
LOCATION: Y Fagal, Moylegrove, Cardigan, Pembrokeshire, SA43 3BU

It was reported that Y Fagal was a characterful stone cottage overlooking Ceibwr Bay. The ancillary use boat house was separated from the house by the unclassified public road to Ceibwr which divided the plot.

Alterations to the house consisted of replacement of the windows with painted accoya timber units, a new natural slate roof, a small portion of which would be fixed roof glazing and the insertion of two roof windows. A redundant heating oil tank would be removed and replaced with a timber garden shed.

The existing boat store would be converted to a studio with box profile roof, solar PV panels and four large roof windows. The front double doors would be glazed under a glazed gable and two additional windows would be added.

The application was before the Committee as Nevern Community Council had objected to the application, contrary to the officer recommendation.

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 an unacceptable impact upon privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties. The Community Council had raised concerns regarding use of the boat house as accommodation, and a condition to ensure use ancillary only to the main dwelling was proposed, together with conditions relating to biodiversity and protected species. The recommendation was one of approval subject to these conditions.

Councillor Richard George addressed the Committee on behalf of Nevern and Moylegrove Community Council. He advised that the Council had no objection to the changes to the main house, however they were concerned at the conversion of the boat store to an artist's studio as they believed the county was being changed by the loss of sheds and outbuildings to accommodation. He noted that the structure currently blended into the countryside unobtrusively, however the Community Council believed that the proposed development would have an



unacceptable impact on the character of the surrounding area and asked officers to look again at the fenestration in particular. They were also concerned about disruption on what was a busy piece of road, well used by farmers. If approved, they asked for a condition to prevent the building ever being changed into accommodation. Mr George noted that the National Park was supposed to be a special place for residents and visitors alike and questioned if the Authority could not control developments like this, what was the point of the National Park at all.

Members asked whether the proposed occupancy condition was strong enough to prevent the building being sold as a separate entity. The officer replied that consideration had been given to requiring a S106 Agreement to secure ownership, however that had not been considered necessary, as long as it was being used as an artist's studio. However, delegated approval was sought to see if the wording of the condition could be tightened up in any way.

With regard to lighting, officers noted that a condition was proposed to condition external lighting, however as the building was not isolated, light spill from the windows would not be out of character when viewed from the beach. It was also noted that as the gable was north facing, it would not catch the sun's glint. It was also requested that some sort of construction management plan be submitted, to ensure the road was not blocked by the delivery of materials.

Approval of the application subject to the conditions set out in the report and amended at the meeting was moved and seconded.

Noting the frustrations of the Community Council with the National Park and the planning system, other Members agreed that similar sentiments were expressed by other Community Councils and suggested that a seminar be organised to explain the position.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve the application subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, occupancy, ecology, lighting and construction environmental management plan.

[Councillors S Alderman, S Hancock, P Morgan, S Skyrme-Blackhall and Michelle Wiggins tendered their apologies and left the meeting at this juncture.]

- 8. Enforcement - EC19/0007 – The Pool House, Hasgurd Cross**
The report set out the planning history regarding the former West Wales Diving Centre pool building at Hasgurd Cross, and in particular a live/work rural enterprise caravan, which continued to be sited on the land



in breach of condition 4 of planning permission NP/12/0614. The owner had failed to return a Requisition for Information Notice served on 26th May 2022, and this was an offence answerable in the Magistrates' Court.

However, at the meeting it was noted that since writing the report, the applicant had sought the advice of a planning agent, had returned the Requisition for Information Notice and was in the process of submitting an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness. Members' authority was therefore not being sought to proceed with prosecution at this time and a further report on the situation would be presented in due course.

Noted.

9. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 4 appeals (against planning decisions made by the Authority) that were currently lodged with the Welsh Government, and detailed which stage of the appeal process had been reached to date in every case.

With regard to the appeal in respect of Pantmaenog Forest, Rosebush, it was noted that this had been called in by Welsh Government and therefore the Planning Inspector would make a recommendation to the Welsh Ministers. While it was understood that this would soon take place, there was no timescale for the Welsh Ministers to issue their decision. The decision, once made, would be circulated to the Committee.

NOTED.

