

# Development Management Committee

25 October 2023

## Present (In Person)

Dr M Havard (Chair)

Councillor Steve Alderman, Councillor Mrs D Clements, Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Councillor R Jordan, Mrs J James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor R Owens, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor B Price, Councillor Mrs M Wiggins, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor C Williams.

## Present (Remotely)

Councillor M James, Mrs S Hoss and Councillor Mrs S Skyrme-Blackhall

## Officers in attendance

Mr C Felgate (Solicitor), Mrs S Morris (Director of Placemaking, Decarbonisation and Engagement), Mrs K Attrill, (Development Management Manager), Ms B Gledhill, Mr R James, Ms C Broome (Planning Team), Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes)

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock and Virtually 10.00am – 11.40am;  
11.50am – 1.15pm]

### 1. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Dr R Heath-Davies and Councillor PJ Morgan.

### 2. **Disclosures of interest**

The following Member(s)/Officer(s) disclosed an interest in the application(s) and/or matter(s) referred to below:

<b>Application and Reference</b>	<b>Member(s)/Officer(s)</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
Minute 6 below – general declaration as an NRW Board Member and Plantlife Trustee	Dr RM Plummer	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting
<i>Minutes 6(a) and (b) below</i> NP/23/0280/FUL St Davids Distillery, Restaurant & Rooms, 11-13, Nun Street, St. Davids	Councillor B Price	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting



*Minute 6(f) below*  
NP/23/0245/FUL The  
Slipway, Sandy Haven  
Beach, Herbrandston

Councillor R Owens

Withdrew from the  
meeting while the  
application was  
discussed

### 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 6 September 2023 were presented for confirmation and signature.

On the proposal of Councillor Dr S Hancock, seconded by Councillor S Alderman, it was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 6 September 2023 be confirmed and signed.

### 4. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011, amended 16 June 2021, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak unless they had spoken on the same application previously when they would have 3 minutes in which to present new information (*the interested parties are listed below against their respective application(s), and in the order in which they addressed the Committee*):

Reference number	Proposal	Speaker
<i>NP/23/0280/FUL</i> <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Changes to existing guest house & residential dining (Class C1) with bespoke gin distillery (B2) & small bar/restaurant (mixed use C1/A3) together with alterations – St Davids Distillery, Restaurant & Rooms, 11-13, Nun Street, St. Davids	Sophie Anderton – Objector – in person
<i>NP/NP/22/0319/FUL</i> <i>Minute 6(c) refers</i>	Retrospective planning application for the subdivision of single dwelling into two dwelling houses – 7, Holbrook Close, Broad Haven,	Shirley Norman – Objector – in person



<i>NP/22/0120/FUL Minute 6(d) refers</i>	Replacement of bar with conference room and facilities. Creation of storage areas, construction of viewing deck and generator house and cliff reinforcement (retrospective) – Thorne Island Hotel, Angle	Shan Williams – Community Council – online
<i>NP/23/0245/FUL Minute 6(f) Refers</i>	Installation of a removable bollard at the top of Sandy Haven Beach slipway – The Slipway, Sandy Haven Beach, Herbrandston	Mr Modesto Galdo – Community Council – in person
<i>NP/22/0032 Minute 6(g) Refers</i>	Demolition of garage and replacement with two-storey building - Pengarn, 18, Ffordd Panteg, Solva	Jane Wells – Objector – online Mr Frazer Nichol – Applicant – in person

## 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, and the Solicitor added that consideration also needed to be given to the National Development Framework - Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 adopted by the Welsh Government on 24 February 2021 as well as its own Local Development Plan 2. The report also noted that the Authority also had a 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. Finally, the Solicitor added that the report didn’t mention that the Authority’s decisions were subject to scrutiny and could be subject to a judicial review and it was therefore important that they were lawfully based.

## NOTED

## 6. Report of Planning Applications

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Development Management Manager, 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/23/0280/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr N Walsh  
PROPOSAL: Changes to existing guest house & residential dining (Class C1) with bespoke gin distillery (B2) & small bar/restaurant (mixed use C1/A3) together with alterations  
LOCATION: St Davids Distillery, Restaurant & Rooms, 11-13, Nun Street, St. Davids, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6NS

It was reported that this application was being brought to the Development Management Committee at the request of a Member, as it raised matters of public interest and due to the Officer recommendation differing from that of the City Council. Twenty third-party responses had been received, with the main points of concern summarised and addressed in the officer's report.

The Committee was informed that the property was located within St David's Conservation Area and Retail Centre as defined by the Local Development Plan (LDP 2). Nos 11-13 were the centre properties of this listed terrace and an application for Listed Building consent NP/23/0281/LBA was found elsewhere on the agenda (Minute 6(b) refers). The premises were currently used as a guesthouse. While the gin still had been installed, it was not currently in use.

The Officer's report set out a detailed consideration of the relevant policies contained within the statutory Development Plan (Future Wales and Local Development Plan 2) and National Planning Policy in the form of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11). It was considered that, having regard to all material considerations, the proposed scheme was unacceptable in terms of its location, and its impact upon residential amenity. The distillery element of the proposal was not a use which was supported by LDP policies on Retail Centres and the proposal as a whole would not support the protection and enhancement of the City's role as an attractive historic centre. The development would cause an unacceptably detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park by altering the character of this part of St Davids. It was considered that the development would cause an unacceptable impact upon the amenity of residential neighbouring properties. Health and safety concerns were not adequately addressed by the layout and design proposed. As such, the proposal was contrary to policies 1, 8, 14, 29, 30 and 60 of the adopted Local Development Plan 2 (2020) and could not be supported.



It was noted at the meeting that there was an unfinished sentence at the top of page 10 (or page 38 of the pack) in respect of the condition requested by the Public Protection Team. Such a condition, to require details of the extraction system to mitigate noise and/or odour emissions to be approved, would have been included had the application been recommended for approval. The DM Manager also noted that although Health and Safety was covered under separate legislation, there was also a requirement within planning policy for a development to be safe. Officers considered that as the distillery room was adjacent to a party wall with bedrooms above, this layout was unsafe and this formed the second reason for refusal.

One Member sought clarification regarding parking at the property and was advised that as it was located within parking zone 1, there was no requirement for any parking and the Highway Authority had no concerns regarding highway safety and had not raised any objection.

There was one speaker, Sophie Anderton who was a planning consultant engaged to represent 12 neighbours of the property in Nun Street. She explained that she had submitted their objections in writing and welcomed the officer recommendation which would protect their amenity. She explained that her clients' amenity was impacted by the existing use as a B&B due to noise as well as poor management of odour and waste and they were concerned that this would be compounded by intensification and additional use, particularly as details of opening hours and events were vague. She also noted that the ambience and soundscape behind the cathedral was specific to that locality and formed part of the setting of the cathedral, and this should be protected.

An additional concern related to the location of the still, in a room facing the street and adjoining number 9. It was considered that this was a low risk, but high impact, proposal and there had been insufficient detail to explain how the risk of explosion would be managed. Ms Anderton suggested that reference to policy 19 – Hazardous Installations should be made in the reasons for refusal as ethanol was a hazardous substance. She considered that the officer recommendation was well justified and hoped a robust decision would be reached which would be upheld at appeal.

Officers responded that Policy 19 related to major installations such as LNG and it wasn't therefore appropriate to use it in this context. However the proposal was contrary to Planning Policy Wales in this regard and this was the basis of the second reason for refusal.



Members considered that while they didn't want to prevent the development of new businesses, these had to be in an appropriate location and could not be supported if they were unsafe. Concern was also expressed regarding the amenity of neighbours. The recommendation of refusal was proposed by Councillor D Clements, seconded by Dr R Plummer.

Some Members were reluctant to support refusal as the Authority had a duty to support the tourism sector and felt that it was important for there to be facilities in St Davids for tourists to enjoy. The existence of other food uses in the vicinity were also noted, and these operated until 11.30pm.

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

- 1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would result in harm being caused to residential amenity by virtue of the intensification of uses within the premises. The proposal does not constitute a use which is appropriate to this location. This would be contrary to Policy 30 (Amenity), and Policy 57 (Town and District Shopping Centres) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2.**
- 2. The proposed layout does not adequately address Health and Safety Concerns in proposing residential accommodation above the distilling room. This is contrary to the provisions of Planning Policy Wales Edition 11 paragraph 3.2.1.**

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/23/0281/LBA  
APPLICANT: Mr N Walsh  
PROPOSAL: Changes to existing guest house & residential dining (Class C1) with bespoke gin distillery (B2) & small bar/restaurant (mixed use C1/A3) together with alterations  
LOCATION: St Davids Distillery, Restaurant & Rooms, 11-13, Nun Street, St. Davids, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6NS

It was reported that listed building consent was sought for the alterations in association with changes to existing guest house & residential dining (Class C1) with bespoke gin distillery (B2) & small bar/restaurant (Mixed Use C1/A3). A consideration of works requiring planning permission was contained within the accompanying planning application (NP/23/0280) (Minute 6(a) refers).



The Grade II properties formed part of a group of three gable-fronted three-storey late C19 houses located within St Davids Conservation Area. The rear elevation was prominently visible from Quickwell Hill, with views also existing from the Cathedral Close and Feidr Chwech Erw.

Details of the proposal were set out in the report and included the addition of a steel kitchen flue to the rear elevation, internal alterations at lower ground, ground, first and second floors to add partitions and fire doors and the fitting of suspended acoustic ceilings to ground and first floor levels.

The report considered the proposals against Cadw's conservation principles and local and national planning policy. Officers considered that the proposed scheme was unacceptable in terms of the preservation of the building and its setting together with the lack of justification of the works. In addition it was considered premature to grant listed building consent for the alterations proposed given the decision of refusal in respect of the corresponding application for full planning permission under NP/23/0280/FUL. As such, the application did not comply with the requirements of current listed building legislation and guidance and the application was recommended for refusal.

The Development Management Manager apologised at the meeting that the comments by Mid and West Wales Fire Service on this application had not also been provided in the report on NP/23/280/FUL. This was an administrative error.

The recommendation of refusal was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Councillor Hancock, and this was carried.

**DECISION: That the application for listed building consent be refused for the following reasons:**

- 1. The proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and setting of the listed building in terms of the proposed metal flue and impact on historic internal fixtures and fabric, notably doors and ceilings. As such, the proposal does not have 'special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of architectural or historic interest which it possesses' (section 66, 1990 Act).**
- 2. The proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the setting adjacent listed buildings in terms of the proposed metal flue when viewed from the north. As such, the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Section 66 of the 1990 Act.**



3. **The proposal is contrary to Policy 30 (Amenity), and Policy 57 (Town and District Shopping Centres) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2. In that this Authority is recommending a corresponding application for full planning permission under NP/23/0280 it is considered premature to to grant listed building consent for the alterations in the absence of acceptable detailed proposals. To do so would be contrary to advice contained in paragraph 5.14 of Technical Advice Note 24 : The Historic Environment (May 2017) and be harmful to the character and appearance of the listed building whereby the abovementioned alterations would be made without justification.**

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/22/0319/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr B Summons  
PROPOSAL: Retrospective planning application for the subdivision of single dwelling into two dwelling houses  
LOCATION: 7, Holbrook Close, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3JE

It was reported that this application was before the Committee due to the concerns raised by The Havens Community Council. Six letters of objection had also been received in response to neighbour notifications and their comments were summarised and addressed in the report.

The report explained that the Authority had received a significant number of complaints from neighbouring local residents about noise levels and disturbance associated with the use of a two-storey detached dwelling within the centre boundary of Broad Haven as a holiday let. Following enforcement investigations, officers considered that it could be demonstrated that the existing property had moved from a C3 use within the Use Class Order 1987 (as amended) to a Sui Generis Party House use without planning permission.

Retrospective planning permission was invited for the subdivision of the property into two dwellings. The existing swimming pool and sunroom would be a shared area for both dwellings. There were no external alterations and amenity space and car parking was provided for each dwelling. The existing dwelling was large and its sub-division would result in the creation of 2 dwellings providing 4 bedrooms and 3 bedrooms each. It was considered that the sub-division of a single large property into two smaller properties was expected to reduce the likelihood of a single large group occupying the property with associated noise and disturbance levels.





The sub-division of the dwelling would result in the creation of a new residential unit. In accordance with Policy 48 of the Local Development Plan and the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing, a financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing would normally be required. In this case however, given the unique circumstances and the need to expedite the resolution of local amenity concerns, no affordable housing contribution was proposed to be sought.

The proposed development was considered acceptable in terms of the principle of sub-dividing the existing dwelling into 2 dwellings. Planning conditions restricting the use of one of the properties to C3 dwelling house only and removing permitted development rights to change use to C5 and C6 were recommended to ensure neighbouring amenity was protected. A further condition preventing the use of both properties together as a single dwelling would also protect neighbouring residential amenity. Subject to the imposition of these conditions, it was considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area or the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties in accordance with the policies of the Local Development Plan. The recommendation was therefore one of approval, subject to conditions.

At the meeting, it was noted that there had been a typographical error in proposed condition 4 which should have designated Dwelling 2 as being used for Class C3 only, rather than Dwelling 1. It was also proposed to add an additional condition to limit use of the swimming pool and sun room to one property only, rather than as a shared facility. The officer clarified that the condition would require the pool to be used as ancillary to the use of Dwelling 2 which should prevent it being let out commercially.

It was also reported that a late response had been received from the Public Protection Department at Pembrokeshire County Council confirming that it had received complaints regarding use of the property and would be opposed to its conversion for holiday use in a residential area due to the potential for noise and antisocial behaviour. Should the Authority be minded to approve this application, they had recommended that a further condition be added requiring submission to the Authority of a management plan detailing how Dwelling 1 would operate as a short term holiday let, covering storage and disposal of waste, hours of arrival and departure and provision of a complaints policy.

There was one speaker on this application, Shirley Norman, who was also speaking on behalf of other residents in Holbrook Close. She explained that when permission was granted in 2016 for a swimming pool and garage extension it was not anticipated that the property would end up being let and being used as a party house sleeping 17 people. She noted that the pool area was a magnet, with its hot tub, children's playhouse,



sound system and cinema, and this magnified the sound of shouting and singing; there were parties almost every night, the property having become a commercial enterprise on a residential estate. This caused great disturbance to residents who were unable to sleep but nevertheless had to go to work and school, etc the next day. The swimming pool had at one point been rented out, causing parking problems. She noted a similar case in Caerphilly where permission for an Airbnb on a residential estate had been refused to prevent stag and hen parties using the property which would result in an adverse impact on the residential amenity of surrounding properties. She noted that there were no other properties of a similar size in The Havens, and considered that a residential estate was not the place for a large tourist business. She feared that if it was allowed to continue to operate it would start a new trend, to the detriment of local communities.

Some Member were concerned that no contribution towards affordable housing was being sought and that this might set a precedent. They received reassurance from officers that they felt that this was an exceptional circumstance.

Several Members were concerned about the impact of the current development on neighbour amenity. They thanked officers for their work in developing conditions which it was hoped would alleviate the current problems, and the officer recommendation, including the additional conditions was proposed by Councillor Owens and seconded by Councillor Clements. In response to a question regarding the Caerphilly case, the officer explained that there were material differences, as the dwelling in the application before the Committee was operating outside of its permission and had a fallback position of a C3 use, so residential use of the property could not be prevented.

**DECISION: That the application be approved, subject to conditions relating to accordance with approved plans and documents, parking, surface water drainage, Property 2 to be used for Use Class C3 only, no use as a single property, boundary treatments, permitted development, use of the swimming pool and agreement of a management plan for use of Property 1 as a short term let.**

[The meeting was adjourned between 11.40 and 11.50am]



- (d) REFERENCE: NP/22/0120/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr M Conner  
PROPOSAL: Replacement of bar with conference room and facilities. Creation of storage areas, construction of viewing deck and generator house and cliff reinforcement (retrospective)  
LOCATION: Thorne Island Hotel, Angle, Pembroke, Pembrokeshire, SA71 5BE

It was reported that Thorne Island Fort, listed Grade II\* lay on a small island just north of West Angle Bay. The fort had been converted to a hotel by 1947 when sash windows were inserted and after a period of neglect, had been undergoing refurbishment since 2017. A listed building application for the proposed works, NP/22/0121/LBA was also before the Committee for consideration (Minute 6(e) refers).

Since the application had been submitted, revised plans had been received removing the new conference centre and landing jetty/boat lift from the application. Arguably, these aspects of the proposed development, visibly led to the greatest impact upon the fort whilst viewed from the coast. Whilst Cadw and PCNPA Building Conservation Officer had no objections to the design of the proposed conference centre, during the application process revised plans had been received to extend and renovate the existing structure used as a Bar area. The revised plans would see the addition of a toilet to the East.

The Officer's report set out a detailed consideration of the relevant policies contained within the statutory Development Plan (Future Wales and Local Development Plan 2) and National Planning Policy in the form of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11). Having regard to these and all material considerations it was considered that the development would be in accord with the Development Plan and the development was considered to provide a development which was acceptable in principle and could be supported by officers. The recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

It was noted at the meeting that although the application was made in retrospect, a great deal of discussion had taken place with the applicants and their agent. It was also noted that the description of proposal on page 96 had omitted reference to the cliff reinforcement, the list of plans was missing from condition 2 and that the wording of condition 3 in respect of protected species mitigation was incorrect, however the correct wording could be found in condition 5 of the Listed Building Application relating to this site NP/22/0121/LBA.



There was one speaker, Shan Williams from Angle Community Council. She explained that the Community Council had become confused by the applications and amendments and sought confirmation that the jetty had been removed from the application and this was provided by officers. She also explained that the Community Council was happier with the change of use of the multi-purpose facilities, and also noted that the area shown on the plans as a viewing area had originally been designated as a helicopter pad and the Council wished to highlight the safety aspect of this as it was level with the parapet. However they were happy with the recommendation of approval.

With regard to the viewing area, the officer stated that health and safety legislation was separate to planning, and no proposal for fencing had been submitted due to the grade 2\* status of the structure. Responsibility for safety on the site lay with its owner.

Members supported the proposed developments and welcome the extensive consultation with the planning team. The recommendation of approval, subject to conditions including those amended at the meeting, was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Dr Plummer.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents and protected species mitigation.**

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/22/0121/LBA  
APPLICANT: Mr M Conner  
PROPOSAL: Replacement of bar with conference room and facilities. Creation of storage areas, construction of viewing deck and generator house and cliff reinforcement (retrospective)  
LOCATION: Thorne Island Hotel, Angle, Pembroke, Pembrokeshire, SA71 5BE

The building Conservation Officer explained that while a recommendation on this application could be made by the Committee, it would need to be referred to Cadw for the final decision due to the Grade II\* listed status of the structure. A consideration of works requiring planning permission was contained within the accompanying planning application (NP/22/0120), Minute 6(d) refers).

The Officer's report set out a detailed consideration of the proposal, which was considered to be appropriate in terms of size, scale and detail. It was considered to comply with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 24,



and Cadw's Conservation Principles. As such, the application could be supported subject to conditions.

It was noted at the meeting that the list of drawings had been omitted from condition 2. The Solicitor also noted that the recommendation should be one of delegated authority to grant listed building consent, subject to approval being given by Cadw.

The recommendation of delegated approval, subject to Cadw's response, was proposed by Councillor Dr Hancock, seconded by Dr Plummer. Members asked to be updated once Cadw decision had been received.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive, Director of Placemaking, Decarbonisation and Engagement or to the Development Management Manager to issue listed building consent upon receipt of approval from Cadw, and subject to conditions relating to timing of the application, accordance with approved plans and documents, approved samples of cladding, method statement to protect the historic environment interests and protected species mitigation.**

[Councillor R Owens disclosed a prejudicial interest in the following application and withdrew from the meeting while it was being considered]

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/23/0245/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mrs D Davies, Herbrandston Community Council  
PROPOSAL: Installation of a removable bollard at the top of Sandy Haven Beach slipway  
LOCATION: The Slipway, Sandy Haven Beach, Herbrandston, Milford Haven, Pembrokeshire, SA73 3ST

It was reported that this proposal for a removable bollard centrally positioned on the slipway of eastern Sandy Haven was before the Committee as a Member sat on the Community Council submitting the application. The objective of the application was to manage the access of the slipway route and beach to reduce types of use that compromised the safety of pedestrians/beach users, marine ecology and the amenity of nearby residents. The proposal would address these issues and provide long-term benefits for the marine environment.

A number of letters of concern had been received with regard to amenity and in response, further clarification was requested from the applicant regarding management of access to the beach, and this was set out in the report. This provided for key access to remove the bollard for those wishing to launch boats. The bollard would be positioned such that access for wheelchairs, child buggies and those wishing to launch small



boats or kayaks of would be retained. A free car park was located nearby.

The Officer's report set out a detailed consideration of the relevant policies contained within the statutory Development Plan (Future Wales and Local Development Plan 2) and National Planning Policy in the form of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11). Having regard to these and all material considerations it was considered that the development would be in accord with the Development Plan and the proposal was considered to provide a development which was acceptable in principle and could be supported by officers. The recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

It was requested at the meeting that an additional condition be included as part of any consent, to require a sign detailing contact details of key holders to be put in place prior to installation of the bollard, and to be maintained as long as it was in place. The officer clarified that as long as this was not larger than 0.3m<sup>2</sup> separate permission for the sign was not required.

Mr Galdo, Chair of Herbrandston Community Council (HCC) then addressed the Committee and explained that HCC felt fortunate to have access to the Waterway within the village and had a duty to protect the environment and ensure it was a safe area for families to visit. Several concerns had been expressed by the public about unnecessary cars on the beach and options had been discussed to manage this. HCC owned a free car park a short distance away and there was no intention to charge. It was noted that HCC did not own the slipway, but had submitted an application to the Land Registry to request this; the outcome was awaited. However it had undertaken repairs to the slip and wall in the past and would continue to do so. HCC was mindful that local boatowners needed access to the slip for launching and the bollard would therefore be secured by a padlock, with the key made available.

Mr Galdo noted that a trial had been undertaken last summer and although there had been some complaints, the feedback had been largely positive – the public had felt more comfortable without cars on the beach and some security protection had been provided to mooring holders. HCC had concluded that a removable bollard was the best solution to protect the Special Area of Conservation and provide safe access to the beach.

Members asked whether any guidance was provided to key holders and whether one bollard was sufficient. Mr Galdo replied that it was anticipated keys would be signed for and agreement sought that these were for personal use only. He also confirmed that a single bollard was



sufficient. Officers also clarified that landowner permission was not required for planning permission to be granted and HCC had signed the correct certificate.

Members were appreciative of the work undertaken by the Community Council in ensuring access for everyone to enjoy the beach and the recommendation of approval, subject to conditions including the additional condition in relation to signage, was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Councillor Alderman and unanimously approved.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents and provision of signage.**

[The Chair noted that there was a supplemental agenda item and that this would be considered at this juncture]

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/22/0032/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms G A Nicol-Hughes  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of garage and replacement with two-storey building  
LOCATION: Pengarn, 18, Ffordd Panteg, Solva, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6TN

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as the Community Council had objected to the application. A number of concerns had also been raised by members of the public and these were outlined and addressed in the report. However it was noted that concerns regarding removal of a hedgebank were unrelated to this proposal.

It was reported that permission had been sought to demolish a garage which was on a parcel of land separated from the house at Pengarn and replace it with a larger building. Although it was described as two-storey, the first-floor storage area was in the roof space, and its height was more consistent with that of a single or 1.5 storey building. Following discussion with officers, the overall scale of the building had been reduced; reference to a florist work area had also been removed from the plans.

The Officer's report set out a detailed consideration of the relevant policies contained within the statutory Development Plan (Future Wales and Local Development Plan 2) and National Planning Policy in the form of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11). Having regard to these and all material considerations it was considered that the development would be in accord with the Development Plan and the development was considered to provide a development which was acceptable in this



location and would not cause an adverse impact on visual amenity or on the special qualities of the National Park. Further the proposal did not have an unacceptable adverse effect on amenity. The application could be supported by officers and the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

It was noted at the meeting that the report didn't contain the comments of the Highway Authority as these had not been placed on the relevant file. It had confirmed that the revised siting had been agreed with the applicants' agent and providing that the plans were amended to show the agreed 200mm margin between the tarmac and the wall, the Highway Authority was happy with the scheme as proposed.

The first of two speakers was Jane Wells who owned an adjacent property and the private access road – her property therefore bounded the site on two sides. She was confused by the submitted drawings which did not contain any datum level or measurements and concerned that the building was larger than the existing garage and encroached on her access. She noted that the lane was narrow and in daily use by agricultural machinery and delivery vehicles as well as residents' and visitors' cars, many of which turned in a restricted area in front of the garage, and a larger building would therefore be more vulnerable to damage. A condition setting out the critical dimensions – a minimum of 200mm between the building and the tarmac, 700mm around the building, ridge height of no more than 4.1m and eaves height at 2.85m was therefore essential; it should also include the existing floor level as datum and be monitored. She remained concerned about road safety and visibility for vehicles exiting her property.

Frazer Nichol, the applicant, then addressed the Committee. He explained that Pengarn had been used as a holiday home since 1982. The garage had been built in the 1940s, however it had been damaged by a vehicle such that the insurers had advised it was unsafe and should be replaced. It was proposed that the building be slightly larger in order to store a variety of paraphernalia, some of which was quite tall, although it had been reduced in size since the application was first submitted. Mr Nichol was grateful for the input of the officers and the Highway Authority.

The officer suggested that an additional levels condition be added and noted that the section drawing showing the levels and dimensions had only been received that morning and apologised that it had not been requested sooner. Members expressed concern about the provision of last-minute information, however the officer reassured them that if a scheme had been changed or would be of disbenefit to objectors it would have been withdrawn from the day's agenda to allow consultation.





The recommendation of approval with conditions, including the additional levels condition, was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Councillor Price and unanimously approved.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, lighting, finishes, water drainage, use as ancillary to Pengarn, biodiversity protection and levels.**

## **7. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 3 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.

An update was sought on the ongoing appeal at Trewern, Nevern and the officer advised that although an application had now been received, the appeal remained and was pending a decision on the application.

**NOTED.**

