

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

19th October 2011

Present: Councillor SL Hancock (Chairman)
Mrs G Hayward, Messrs D Ellis, R Howells, E Sangster; Councillors
JS Allen-Mirehouse, JA Brinsden, ML Evans, RR Evans, RN
Hancock, M James, RM Lewis, PJ Morgan, WL Raymond and M
Williams .

(NPA Offices, Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock: 10.00a.m. – 12.15pm)

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Ms C Gwyther, Mrs F Lanc
and Councillor HM George.

2. Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman congratulated Mr Andrew Richards in obtaining his
Masters Degree in Planning.

3. Disclosures of interest

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

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minute 8(b) below</i> <i>NP/11/297</i> Change of use of Agricultural land to garden, Silk Purse, Whitehall Farm, Angle Village, Angle	Councillor JS Allen- Mirehouse	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minute 9(a) below</i> EC11/0117 – 2 Maes y Bont, Mynachlogddu	Councillor SL Hancock and Mr D Ellis	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 21st September 2011 were
presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 21st
September 2011 be confirmed and signed.



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. As agreed at the meeting of the Policy Committee held on the 26th February 2003, when the right to speak scheme was reviewed, interested parties would now be called upon to speak in the order that the applications appeared on the agenda (*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/08/434 <i>Minute 8(a) refers</i>	Enlargement of existing hay barn, erection of cattle shed, yard and pigsties and formation of hedgebanks and the provision of slurry tanks, Llethyr, Cwm Gwaun	Mr Rheinallt Evans, Agent
NP/11/321 <i>Minute 8(d) refers</i>	Change of use to equestrian stud, including stables, associated offices and stores and siting of residential caravan, Hen Treferfyn, Berea, Haverfordwest	Mr Christopher Kimpton, Agent
NP/11/327 <i>Minute 8(e) refers</i>	New dwelling with approval sought for access only, Land opposite Y Gorlan, Glanrhyd	Mr Paul Nicholls, Planning Consultant
NP/11/347 <i>Minute 8(h) refers</i>	Replacement waterfront wall with access ramp and erection of open sided canopy over existing dry dock with terrace, Ferryway, The Alley, Cosheston	Mr Andrew How, Objector



6. Planning Applications received since the last meeting

The Head of Development Management reminded Members of the protocol that had been introduced whereby “new” applications would now be reported to Committee for information. These “new” applications were ones that had been received since preparation of the previous agenda and were either to be dealt with under officers’ delegated powers or at a subsequent meeting of the Development Management Committee. The details of these 31 applications were, therefore, reported for information.

NOTED.

7. Human Rights Act

The Head of Legal Services reminded the Committee that the Human Rights Act provided that, from the 2nd October 2000, the rights set out in the European Convention on Human Rights would be accessible direct in the British Courts.

The Act required that, as far as was possible, existing legislation had to be read and given effect in a way which was compatible with the Convention rights. Furthermore, it would be unlawful for public authorities to act in a way that was incompatible with Convention rights.

In the planning sphere, relevant rights could attach both to applicants for planning permission, and also to third parties who might be adversely affected by a proposed development. Consequently it was essential that the way in which the Authority decided planning issues was characterised by fairness, and that the Authority struck a fair balance between the public interest, as reflected in the Town and Country Planning legislation, and individual rights and interests.

Accordingly, the following reports of the Head of Development Management, which were before Members that day, had been prepared with express and due regard to the Convention on Human Rights. In particular:

- A. In assessing each application, every effort had been made to consider, and place before Members, all the arguments put forward:
 - (i) by those seeking planning permission;
 - (ii) by those opposing the grant of planning permission, and
 - (iii) by those suggesting conditions deemed appropriate if permission was to be granted.



- B. Each planning application to be considered by the Committee was the subject of an individual Appraisal and Recommendation. These embraced a balancing of any competing interest.

It was **RESOLVED** that the report of the Head of Legal Services be noted.

8. Reports of the Head of Development Management

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Head of Development Management, wherein were listed the comments of various organisations that had been consulted on a number of applications for planning permission. Upon consideration of all available information, which included late representations that were reported verbally at the meeting, the Committee determined the applications as recorded below (*the decision reached on each follows the details of the relevant application*):

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/08/434
APPLICANT: Mr D James
PROPOSAL: Enlargement of existing hay barn, erection of cattle shed, yard and pigsties and formation of hedgebanks and provision of slurry tanks
LOCATION: Llethyr, Cwm Gwaun

This application, which it was reported had been registered in September 2008 and been the subject of discussion since that time, sought planning permission as set out above. The principle of the development as submitted was considered to be acceptable in design terms, and with regard to its impact on the National Park landscape and amenities of the area, subject to a Section 106 Agreement tying the land to the buildings and requiring outside storage areas to be identified. However the Section 106 had not been forthcoming. In addition a site visit in 2010 found that the development had commenced to a different design to that applied for. While the changes to the hay barn and cattle shed were considered to be acceptable, the changes to the pig sties and the depositing of soil were considered to be of an unacceptable design and had an adverse impact on the landscape character and visual amenities of the area. Despite numerous requests, the full information required to resolve the matter had not been forthcoming. The recommendation was therefore that a further two months be given for the provision of the necessary information and in the absence of this that the application be refused.

It was reported at the meeting that since the report had been written, a further letter had been received from the Agent stating that the spoil had been moved and plans would be provided, and that a Section 106 Agreement would be provided in due course. Officers went on to say that



it was of concern that this work had again been carried out without the approval of the Authority and that detailed scaled proposals would be necessary.

Mr Rheinallt Evans, the applicant's Agent, had indicated his wish to speak on the application, and he was then invited to do so. He drew Members' attention to the advice of the Authority's Agricultural Adviser who had expressed the view that the buildings were commensurate with the needs of the holding. He also drew attention to other buildings of concern within the wider landscape and the complicated nature of the planning system and noted that an enforcement action undertaken against his client in the past had in fact collapsed and he therefore considered it had been unnecessary. Mr Evans went on to explain that he had met the Officer on site at the end of July and since that time had made efforts to tidy the site up and move the surplus soil. He had attempted to send correspondence to the National Park Offices, however this had never been received as insufficient postage had been paid. He asked that consideration be given under the current application for a recently proposed additional storage shed so that all matters could be sorted out as efficiently as possible.

The Head of Development Management responded that with regard to the enforcement action, this had been against unauthorised development and was appropriate action. With regard to the storage shed that Mr Evans had referred to, this was new development and therefore needed to be considered under a new application.

Members agreed with officers that the current development was unacceptable in the National Park, an area of high landscape importance. A Section 106 agreement was needed, together with buildings of proper design that were suitable for a National Park. They agreed that an additional two months was a reasonable timescale for the necessary work to be carried out and agreed that the application could be refused under delegated powers if this had not been the case. They also agreed that any new development should be the subject of a new application.

DECISION: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report unless within two months of the date of the Committee the following information had been received:

- 1) Satisfactory plans that provided sufficient and acceptable information regarding the location of the disposal of the spoil and details of the existing and proposed levels for this disposal. This information should include measures to integrate any remaining bunding within the surrounding topography and provide full landscaping proposals**



- 2) Receipt of satisfactory plans for the alterations to the pig pens to provide a design that had uniform materials and that were fit for purpose (ie designed for use by pigs with an outside pen area)
- 3) Completion of a Section 106 Agreement to:
 - a) identify areas for outside storage and limit storage to those areas;
 - b) ensure that no part of the land was severed from the buildings or vice versa.

A timescale for carrying out the agreed works would be the subject of a planning condition.

[Councillor JS Allen-Mirehouse disclosed an interest in the following application and withdrew from the meeting while it was being considered]

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/11/297
APPLICANT: Ms L Allerton
PROPOSAL: Change of use of Agricultural Land to Garden
LOCATION: Silk Purse, Whitehall Farm, Angle

This application was for a change of use of agricultural land to form an extended curtilage to the above-mentioned property, which currently had a very small authorised curtilage consisting of a rear patio area and narrow strip of land. In view of this, the owner had extended the land southwards creating a new boundary to the site in line with the boundary of the adjacent property and the application was made in retrospect, with works consisting of a post and rail fence and lawn garden area already having been carried out. Following consideration of the policy framework and the characteristics of the site, officers considered that the application was acceptable, subject to conditions preventing any structures on the land as well as a condition requiring the submission of a landscaping scheme to provide for a new native hedgerow to soften the boundary and to integrate it in the rural setting. The Centre Boundary for Angle would remain unchanged, supporting the objective to prevent the construction of any structures on the land.

Mr Alan Jones, the applicant's agent had indicated that he wished to speak at the meeting, however he did not attend.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions.



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/11/312
APPLICANT: Mr J Pugh
PROPOSAL: Installation of 4 liquid nitrogen storage vessels and vapourisers
LOCATION: South Hook LNG Terminal, Dale Road, Herbrandston

It was reported that this application sought to provide additional plant at the site to improve upon the existing system reliability and offer more robustness during maintenance periods. The structures would be located adjacent to and interconnected with the existing system, complementing the existing site and integrating in a manner that officers considered was not out of place or keeping with the visual amenity of the site and its surroundings. In terms of safety and public amenity, the site was not publicly accessible and lay a considerable distance from neighbours in the village of Herbrandston. The proposal would not result in additional liquid nitrogen being brought through the site. On the basis of these considerations and the policy contained within the Local Development Plan, the development was considered to be acceptable and was recommended for approval.

While not disagreeing with the officer's recommendation, one Member regretted that more did not appear to have been done to mitigate the visual impact of the LNG Terminal on the landscape and in terms of lighting when the original application had been considered. A number of other Members made the point that these were not small structures that could easily be hidden by landscaping, and noted that much time and effort had indeed been spent in putting mitigation measures in place. Another Member asked whether any financial commitment to the community of Herbrandston could be obtained, given the multi million pound nature of the development. With regard to this latter point, the officer replied that given that this was a modest extension, such a commitment would be difficult to justify, and should have been sought when the original application was submitted, however no policy framework to allow this existed at that time. However she agreed to write a letter to accompany the decision raising the issues of sensitive lighting and benefits to the local community.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions.



- (d) REFERENCE: NP/11/321
APPLICANT: Mr A Hart
PROPOSAL: Change of use to equestrian stud, including stables, associated offices and stores and siting of residential caravan
LOCATION: Hen Treferfyn, Berea, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this was a retrospective application for the siting of a static residential caravan, and alterations and change of use of the buildings at the above mentioned site to create an equine stud farm. TAN 6 and Development Plan Policy made it clear that new dwellings for new rural enterprises, even temporary ones, needed to be based on clear financial and functional need. The current application, plus evidence on site, had not provided sufficient justification that there was a need for a residential presence on site, or why this particular site needed to be developed. As a result the change of use and the associated need for a dwelling was not considered to be robustly justified and was contrary to both national policy and the Local Development Plan. Consequently the proposal was considered harmful to the special qualities of the National Park. The retrospective nature of the application was not a justification for planning permission and as a result refusal was recommended.

It was reported at the meeting that a further letter had been received from a third party disputing that 11 hectares of land was rented to the applicant. Officers considered that this further called into question the justification supporting the application.

Mr Chris Kimpton, the agent, then addressed the Committee. He stated that the applicant was a well known businessman who had been breeding horses for 40 years. The application had been supported by the Agricultural Adviser, whose report addressed the criteria set out in TAN 6. No new buildings were proposed, and a 3 year consent for the caravan had been suggested, which would allow time for the evidence for the viability of the business to be sought. Mr Kimpton disagreed with officers that there was a negative impact on the National Park, believing that the buildings looked better as a result of the work carried out. However this work had not been completed and that was the reason that the holding was not currently economically active, with the horses being held elsewhere in the County. No objections had been received from statutory consultees and Mr Kimpton stated that 3-4 additional jobs would be created, in addition to opportunities being created for equine management student placements from Pembrokeshire College. He concluded by asking Members to visit the site.

Councillor WL Raymond spoke in favour of the application, noting that the applicant was a successful businessman who had tidied up the holding.



He contended that farm holdings had to change and believed that now was a good time to start a stud farm, which would support the recent development at the Ffos Las Racecourse. He considered that it was essential to have someone living on site, given the level of theft in the countryside, and believed that the caravan was well hidden. He moved that permission be granted.

The Head of Development Management reiterated that officers concerns related mainly to anomalies within the submission, rather than the principle of diversification of the holding. Given that a caravan had been sited on the holding it would have been expected that more than 4 horses would be stabled there. In addition buildings identified for fodder storage were being used for domestic storage. There was also conflicting information with regard to the potential number of employees and the size of the holding. These discrepancies affected the business plan and therefore the financial viability of the holding. Therefore it was not considered that the justification of the need for the enterprise at this location in particular had been demonstrated and that national policy had therefore not been complied with.

Some Members expressed concern about the detailing of the two-storey barn and whether the enterprise was sustainable without the disputed 11 hectares. Officers replied that the Agricultural Adviser's recommendation had been made on the basis that this land was currently rented, and with regard to the detailing of the building, it would be difficult to condition as the application was retrospective. However other Members added that they did not think there was a problem with the change of use of the site, the Agricultural Adviser considered the holding to be viable and that there was plenty of land available around St Davids even if the 11ha was not currently rented. They agreed that placing a three year condition on the caravan would allow time for the business to develop. Others added that there were few businesses expanding in Pembrokeshire, and encouragement should be given to those trying to develop; they felt it was unlikely that such effort would be put into an enterprise that was unlikely to succeed.

DECISION: That the application be approved, subject to a 3 year temporary permission being granted for the caravan and conditions limiting use of the holding to a stud farm and with regard to lighting.

As the application was approved contrary to the officers' recommendation, Members reasons for granting permission were sought, and this was given as promotion of the local rural economy.



- (e) REFERENCE: NP/11/327
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs G Davies
PROPOSAL: New dwelling with approval sought for access only
LOCATION: Land opposite Y Gorlan, Glanrhyd, Cardigan

It was reported that this was an outline application for a single dwelling, with approval for the means of access. The site lay in the open countryside whereby residential development was not permitted except where it was either sensitive infilling or rounding off of an existing hamlet. As the site lay on its own opposite the ribbon development of Glanrhyd which ran along the northern side of the highway, the proposal was considered to be contrary to these policy requirements and was recommended for refusal. Officers also considered that development of the site for residential development would harm the open countryside character of the site and be at odds with the settlement pattern of Glanrhyd. This was a further reason for refusal.

The application was brought before the Development Management Committee as the Community Council had supported the proposal, which was contrary to the officer's recommendation of refusal.

The Head of Development Management stated at the meeting that a similar application had been refused in the 1990's and the decision upheld at appeal. There had been no material change in circumstances since that time and the proposal remained one of new development in the open countryside. She also noted that four houses had recently been granted permission on the site of a former garage on the opposite side of the road, but this did not alter the recommendation regarding development on the opposite side of the road. Since writing the report a letter, which had also been sent to Members, had been received from the applicant's Planning Consultant which commented upon what he considered to be inadequacies with the report to Members and appended the policy statement which accompanied the application. The Head of Development Management advised that it was not the role of the planning officers to present the applicant's full case in their reports and Members could view the full submission if they wished.

Mr Nicholls, the Planning Consultant, then spoke. He wished to address what he considered to be the inadequacies of the report to the Committee and referred Members to his letter which set these out. He asked Members to defer consideration of the application until they had had the opportunity to read the planning statement which had accompanied the application and also to visit the site. He believed that the matter revolved around the officer's opinion on 'rounding off' permitted under Policy 7 and whether the site was located in open countryside. He noted that the four dwellings permitted within the settlement and referred to by the officer



were being developed commercially, and he contrasted that with this proposal for a single dwelling by a local couple. He was also concerned that further information had been raised verbally at the meeting and urged Members to read the information he had circulated to them which set out ten key elements in support of the application

The Chairman checked that all Members had received the letter referred to by Mr Nicholls, and all agreed that they had.

Councillor M James began by stating that he did not consider that the addition of this one dwelling would change the character of Glanrhyd, particularly as there was new development on the opposite side of the road. There was potential that visibility could also be improved on the corner. The site was unique in that it was bounded by the road and river on two sides and would be difficult to extend at a later date. He believed that a site visit would help Members with their decision. Other Members, however, agreed with officers that the site was attractive and that there had been no material changes since the previous application had been refused. The provision of new information regarding the development of 4 dwellings within the village prompted support for a site visit and another Member asked whether any discussions had taken place regarding release of the site as an exception site for a local person together with a Section 106 Agreement. The Officer advised that any such discussions would have to form part of a new application, however the Member asked that such a possibility be explored with the applicant as he would be raising this issue at the next meeting if the application were deferred.

DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow Members to carry out a site inspection.

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/11/337
APPLICANT: Mr RS Scourfield
PROPOSAL: Construction of Greenhouse
LOCATION: The Manse, Cresswell Quay, Kilgetty

Planning permission was sought for the construction of a greenhouse in the rear garden of this residential dwelling. The application would normally have been considered under delegated procedures but was brought before the Committee as the applicant was a member of the Authority's staff.

The land on which the greenhouse would be located sloped steeply, and it would therefore be visible when viewed from the south-west. However the applicant had agreed to cut the base of the structure into the hillside as far as practicable, and it was considered that existing vegetation within



this mature garden would materially lessen any visual impact. Officers therefore considered that the proposed development accorded with the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan and approval was recommended.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions.

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/11/343
APPLICANT: Mr Justin Pugh
PROPOSAL: Siting of a two storey steel clad modular building to provide temporary administration accommodation for a period of 5 years for on site core contractors and will include three meeting rooms, offices, canteen, locker/drying room, cleaners store and toilets
LOCATION: South Hook LNG Terminal, Dale Road, Herbrandston

This proposal was for the siting of a two storey modular building to provide office accommodation for the contract workers at the Terminal. It was justified for the operational needs of the site, and allowed the rationalisation of the existing cabins and facilities into one central location. The proposal was not considered to harm the special qualities of the National Park or the Historic landscape, and subject to conditioning, including no residential use, the removal of the existing cabins, external lighting and drainage, no objection was raised to the proposal.

It was reported at the meeting that the Countryside Council for Wales had replied that they had no comments.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions.

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/11/347
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs MF Smith
PROPOSAL: Replacement of waterfront wall with access ramp and erection of open sided canopy over existing dry dock with terrace
LOCATION: Ferryway, The Alley, Cosheston

This application sought approval for a new waterfront scheme for Ferryway, a residential property to the east of the estuary. The application was brought before the Committee as the views of officers of the Authority differed from those of Cosheston Community Council. Officers considered that the proposal caused no significant detrimental impact upon the existing character of the area, or integrity of the Historic Landscape. Neither was it considered to have any significant detrimental



impact upon the existing amenity levels of the area. The site neighboured a designated Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest, and in this respect the potential environmental impact of the proposed development had been assessed and was considered to be acceptable. The application was therefore considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan and was recommended for approval.

It was reported at the meeting that there was an error in the report, which referred to a new decked terrace, however this was already existing. It was also reported that a further letter had been received from the applicant's agent, pointing out this error and noting that the removal of the sycamore tree had already been agreed by the tree officer to allow essential works to the wall.

Mr Andrew How, an objector, then addressed the Committee. His concerns related mainly to the canopy over the dry dock area and terrace, which he believed needed modification, and he urged Members to visit the site and walk along the foreshore. He stated that many trees along the foreshore in this location had been cut down and this made the house and garden more visible. Extension of the building to the high water mark and the creation of a new living area overlooking the beach would have a detrimental impact on those using the foreshore. He noted that officers acknowledged that there was some existing impact, but didn't think that the proposals would cause any additional detrimental impact – this he said was a matter of judgement.

Officers showed a short video clip taken by officers of the view from the river looking back towards the site which they hoped would assist Members' deliberations.

While considering that the cladding of the wall would be an improvement, Members agreed with Coshaston Community Council in their dislike of the design of the canopy over the dry dock area, considering it to be incongruous in the landscape. They believed the estuary was an important landscape and that the Authority should not allow anything which would have a detrimental impact upon it. They all agreed that a simple pitched roof would be more in keeping, with their concerns relating to the design of the structure, rather than the principle.

DECISION: That the application be refused due to the adverse effect of the incongruous design of the canopy over the dry dock area on the landscape.



- (i) REFERENCE: NP/11/356
APPLICANT: Mr A Richards
PROPOSAL: Extend existing car park for vehicles & trailers for transporting horses
LOCATION: Car Park, Amroth

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as it had been submitted by the National Park Authority. The Solicitor reminded Members that they should exclude this information from their consideration, and decide the application solely on its planning merits.

The application site was located within Amroth car park, and the application sought consent to replace an existing strip of grass adjacent to the parking area with an additional parking facility to accommodate vehicles and trailers for transporting horses. The application also included the provision of a timber fence bounding the adjoining grass area to prevent pedestrians and horses gaining access to the adjacent stream.

Officers considered that the proposed development would provide a necessary facility for the nearby coast path, beach and other rights of way. The development was considered to be in a sustainable form and would not have an adverse impact on the amenity or privacy of neighbouring properties, biodiversity and flooding or land stability. No adverse comments were reported to the Committee as a result of public consultation, and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Brinsden reported that the grassed area was little used and its use for car parking would be more beneficial to the area. Other Members questioned whether there would be a net loss of car parking spaces as a result of the proposal, which would be detrimental to the economy of the village, and also whether the area would be better used for car parking, with another area within the car park allocated for horse boxes. Councillor Brinsden replied that currently the horse boxes took up several parking spaces within the car park so he did not believe there would be any detrimental effect. The officer agreed to ask the applicant whether any better layout for the parking spaces could be found, to make the most effective use of the land, and also whether the existing bottle bank could be incorporated into the scheme, rather than it taking up one of the parking spaces.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions.

[Councillor SL Hancock and Mr D Ellis disclosed an interest in the following item and withdrew from the room while it was considered]



9. Enforcement

(a) EC11/0117 – 2 Maes y Bont, Mynachlogddu

It was reported that in June 2011 it was brought to the attention of the Authority that a breach of planning control involving the subdivision of a single dwelling house into two separate units of accommodation may have taken place at the above mentioned property. A Planning Contravention Notice was served on the owner of the property, to be completed and returned within 21 days. As the Notice was not returned, the Authority wrote to the owner enclosing a further copy of the Notice for completion within 7 days, with a reminder that failure to return the notice was an offence answerable in the Magistrates' Court. It was reported at the meeting that the Planning Contravention Notice had still not been returned to the Authority.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Head of Development Management be authorised to instruct solicitors to commence prosecution proceedings in the Magistrates' Court for the non-return of the Planning Contravention Notice.

[Councillor JS Allen-Mirehouse tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture]

10. Other Planning Issues

(a) Tree Preservation Order TPO 123 – Morningside, Francis Rd, Saundersfoot

No objections had been received to TPO 123 and it would therefore be confirmed on 10th November 2011

NOTED.

(b) Tree Preservation Order TPO 124 – Land adjacent to Bryn Eithin, Eglwysrwrw

It was reported at the meeting that one objection had been received to TPO 124 on the grounds that proper procedure had not been followed and the tree had little amenity value. Officers were initially satisfied that the correct procedures had been followed and considered that this tree had substantial amenity value being one of the largest specimens of this species in the area. However as it had been questioned whether due service had been achieved, for the avoidance of doubt officers were prepared to re-serve the documentation. A further report would be brought to Members in due course.

NOTED.



(c) Tree Preservation Order TPO 125 – Land adjacent to Parc-yr-efail, Felindre Farchog

One objection had been received to this Order stating that the trees (1 Sycamore and 2 Ash) were a danger to the property known as Cwmteg. The Tree Officer considered that the trees were of amenity value to the area, however following receipt of the letter of objection, a further site visit took place to assess any issues that could affect the longevity of the trees, and thus the amenity value. A fungal fruiting body was found on an existing wound of the central ash tree. It was therefore recommended that TPO 125 be confirmed but with the omission of the two ash trees.

One Member questioned whether Sycamore trees were worthy of preservation, as he had been advised some years ago that they did not support biodiversity and should be cut down. The Head of Development Management replied that this particular tree had amenity value within the housing estate and should therefore be protected.

It was **RESOLVED** that TPO 125 relating to 1 Sycamore tree only be confirmed.

(d) Tree Preservation Order TPO 126 – Penrhyn, Newport

The Tree Officer considered that the Sycamore tree the subject of the Order made a significant contribution to the rural character of the area. One letter of objection had been received stating that there was no threat to the tree. The Tree Officer considered that due to its location and the proximity of power lines, work would be required on the tree in the future and as such the implementation of a TPO would ensure that the work was carried out in accordance with good arboricultural practice to retain its visual amenity and also that it would be appropriately protected during recently approved building works. It was therefore recommended that the TPO be confirmed.

It was **RESOLVED** that TPO 126 be confirmed.

11. Delegated applications/notifications

32 applications/notifications had been issued since the last meeting under the delegated powers scheme that had been adopted by the Committee, the details of which were reported for Members' information.

A Member asked whether there was a timescale for the removal of the buildings at the Tenby Ford garage (NP/11/122). The Head of Development Management agreed to check the decision notice and to report back to the Member in question.

It was also reported that there was an error in the description of NP/11/301 which should have read Installation of one Proven 11 (6kw)



wind turbine with a 5.5m blade diameter, 15m hub height measuring 17.75m from ground to tip.

NOTED.

12. Appeals

The Head of Development Management reported on 13 appeals (against planning decisions made by the Authority) that were currently lodged with the Welsh Assembly Government, and detailed which stage of the appeal process had been reached to date in every case.

NOTED.

13. Urgent business

It was **RESOLVED** that by reason of special circumstances, the following items be considered as a matter of urgency, pursuant to Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

14. Other Matters – Site of Former Royal Gatehouse Hotel, Tenby

Members asked about progress with regard to development of this site, and an update was provided by officers. Concern was also expressed about the appearance of the site as Members reported that the hoardings were damaged and the applicant appeared to be taking no action to keep the site in a tidy condition; they asked whether enforcement action could be taken. Officers agreed to look into the matter to see if any action could be taken, and a report would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee.

NOTED.

