DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (Site Inspections)

13 February 2023

Present: Dr M Havard (Chair)

Mr GA Jones, Councillor R Jordan, Councillor Mrs V Thomas and

Councillor C Williams.

Officers Present: Ms K Attrill and Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes).

(Site Inspection: 10.00am -11.00 am)

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Alderman, Councillor Mrs D Clements, Councillor Dr S Hancock, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs S Hoss, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor Mrs S Skyrme-Blackhall, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor M Wiggins.

2. Purpose of the Visit

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 decision 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 all been considered at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 1 February 2023 when it had been deferred to allow a site inspection to take place.

3. NP/21/0085/FUL - Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement - Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepaside, Narberth, Pembrokeshire, SA67 8NS

The planning officer reminded the Committee that this was a large caravan park accommodating just under 200 static caravan pitches. Forty-seven of these were permitted under a change from 55 touring pitches at the northern end of the holiday park (reference: NP/10/0450). Only 37 of the pitches had been implemented, with the intention of improving the internal layout of the caravan park and allowing a greater degree of landscaping, and it was 9 of the remaining pitches which were now being proposed for relocation to an area of land where no permission



to site caravans had previously been approved. It was not proposed to increase the overall number of pitches within the site.

It was noted that application was acceptable in terms of policy. The area in which the caravans were to be located would be visually contained within the holiday park, particularly with the additional boundary treatments proposed which would provide additional screening along the boundary with the road and the property to the south. The development if approved would also be subject to a condition requiring the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to refer to all land within the caravan site which was in the applicant's ownership, rather than the application site to which it was proposed to relocate the caravans only.

It was reported that correspondence had been received which raised concerns including the privacy impact from the proposed static caravans on existing residential properties, as well as the potential for noise and disturbance from occupiers of the site, and these objections had been reported to the Committee. Two of the objectors had given permission for the Committee to view the application site from their gardens.

The Committee walked around the northern part of the site from which the caravans had been relocated and then looked down over the application site from the rear of the clubhouse, from where the roofs of the neighbouring properties were visible. The location of a hedge to replace the trees which had been removed was indicated. Members then walked onto the site itself; it was noted that the roadside hedge was to be retained, except the portion that would be replaced to allow for the creation of an improved visibility splay at the entrance to the caravan site. It was pointed out that the hedge had been excluded from the red line which delineated the application site, to ensure that it would be retained; the caravans would be sited 7-10 metres from it. Members asked about the levels on site, and the officer agreed to ask for a levels plan to be submitted prior to consideration of the application by the Committee. The officer also agreed to check the arboricultural report regarding a particular tree which was marked as to be retained.

The Committee then walked along the road and viewed the site from the gardens of neighbouring properties 'High Chaparral' and 'Cwm Dingle'.

On returning to the site, the Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the site inspection.

