

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
(Site Inspections)**

**16 November 2022**

Present: Dr M Havard (Chair)

Councillor S Alderman, Councillor Dr S Hancock, Dr R Heath-Davies,  
Councillor R Jordan, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor V Thomas,  
Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor M Wiggins.

Officers Present: Mrs S Morris, Ms K Attrill, Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes).

(Site Inspection: Saundersfoot 10.15am – 11.00am)

**1. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mrs D Clements, Mrs S Hoss, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor R Owens, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor Mrs S Skyrme-Blackhall and Councillor C Williams.

**2. NP/22/0388/FUL – Replacement dwelling - Kenmore, Pen y Craig, The Glen, Saundersfoot**

The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and reminded them that the purpose of the visit that day was purely to enable them to acquaint themselves with the application site and its surroundings. No discussion would take place and no decisions would be made until the planning application was considered at a future meeting of the Development Management Committee.

Members were reminded that the application had been considered at the Development Management Committee on 19 October 2022 when it had been deferred to allow a site inspection to take place. Planning permission was sought for the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement with a flat roofed, two storey property, increasing to three storey towards the east. There was an existing detached pool house, adjacent to an external swimming pool which it was also proposed to replace.

Whilst it was noted that the proposed contemporary design differed to the surrounding dwellings, these varied in terms of their scale and designs and there was no consistent or uniform design in the area. The proposed dwelling was also set back from the front of the site to improve parking and turning, and its siting, and established vegetation within the area, reduced its visibility. As a result, the proposed development was considered acceptable in terms of its scale, design, siting and materials and would not have a detrimental impact on the character or visual



amenities of the surrounding area or on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The recommendation was one of approval, subject to conditions.

The officer circulated new plans which showed that the height of the proposed dwelling was not greater than the height of the chimney of the existing, as part of the property would be dug into the slope. It would also be 'pivoted' so that it faced out to sea, and would therefore be moving closer to the boundary, and it was agreed to include the distance of the proposed property to its nearest neighbour in the report to the Development Management Committee. With regard to overlooking, officers did not consider that this would be any greater than from the existing property.

Members walked around the site, and as the applicant was present during the site visit were able to access the inside of the property, and from the top floor window, see the relationship with the surrounding buildings. The officer advised that the design had been considered in the context of these properties. In response to a question about the number of flat roofed dwellings within the estate, one Member said he had counted four, and the officer agreed to confirm this before the meeting.

Noting the limited space available for a ground source heat pump, one Member asked about the proposed heating system for the property and was advised that there would be photovoltaic panels.

Thanking everyone for their attendance, the Chair closed the site inspection.

