

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
(Site Inspections)**

27th June 2011

Present: Councillor SL Hancock (Chairman)
Mrs F Lanc, Mrs G Hayward, Councillors JA Brinsden, M James, PJ Morgan, WL Raymond and M Williams.

(Site Inspection: 10.15a.m. – 11.00a.m.)

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs D Ellis, Mr EA Sangster, Mr R Howells, Councillors JS Allen-Mirehouse, ML Evans, RR Evans, HM George, RM Lewis and RN Hancock.

2. Chairman's Introduction

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. He stated that the purpose of the visit that day was purely to enable Members to gather the facts associated with the applications, and to acquaint themselves with the application sites. No decision would be made until the applications was considered by the meeting of the Development Management Committee, scheduled to be held on the 20th July 2011, when a report of that morning's meeting would be presented to Members.

The Chairman went on to explain that the Committee would be inspecting two sites at Meadow House that morning – alterations and extensions to the existing clubhouse, followed by that for 8 lodges. These two applications would be considered separately.

3. NP/10/451 – Alterations & extension to existing clubhouse, Meadow House Holiday Park, Summerhill, Amroth

The Head of Development Management explained that this application sought consent for alterations and extension to the clubhouse to provide increased facilities for both residents on the site and for non residents. The application had generated a number of objections, and these were set out in the report to the Committee on 15th June. It was reported that the Highway Authority had responded requiring the highway improvements (which included a new roundabout within the site) to be carried out before the clubhouse was refurbished.

Officers accepted that the proposed facilities were not detrimental to the local community, and were acceptable in principle, but they had expressed concern over the design and scale of the proposed alterations and extensions. The architect had attempted to overcome these concerns through the submission of revised plans, but these remained unacceptable on design grounds. It was noted that when consent had



been granted previously for alterations and extensions to the building these had been of a more acceptable scale and design. Officers were also concerned that the prominence of the property and its elevated position would cause adverse harm to the amenities of nearby properties and the surrounding area through additional noise and light spillage, and the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Mike Harris from the Highway Authority was then invited to address the Committee. He explained that he had not recommended refusal but approval, on condition that the road improvements were carried out prior to the extended clubhouse being open to the public. He noted that his view had been strengthened that morning as a result of the congestion experienced, which showed that the flow of traffic on the site would be improved if there was more room, including space for visitors to stop at reception. He concluded that there would be no significant increase in traffic that would warrant any further requirements than those set out.

The applicant's Agent was then invited to speak. He suggested that Members view the clubhouse from the lower level and noted that the previously approved application for alterations to the clubhouse had included a similar forward extension of the building, but at a lesser ridge height, and that a similar sized external area had also been agreed. The roundabout had been proposed as the applicant had recognised the need to ease congestion.

Mrs Joyce Lewis then spoke on behalf of Amroth Community Council, stating that they had unanimously recommended that the application be approved, considering it to be beneficial to the site and the economy of the area. She also noted that she had lived in the village for many years and that neither she, personally, nor the Community Council had ever received complaints regarding noise from the Site.

Members of the Community were then invited to speak. The first was Mr Gareth Holden who spoke on behalf of a number of long standing residents by saying that they had complained about noise to the management of the premises. They were concerned that the relocation of the children's play area, coupled with an increased number of windows and the terraced area would lead to noise being brought almost to their back doors at night. He also noted that the elevation of the site meant that it could be seen for miles, completely out of context. Mrs Plank who owned the Caravan Site opposite added that she had complained to Pembrokeshire County Council about the noise, and another neighbour, Mr Dorian Evans, didn't think that anyone complaining about noise would go to the Community Council.

The applicant, Mr Hugh Pendleton, then responded to some of these points. He noted that the area on which permission for the children's play



area was sought already had consent for tennis courts and a golf course, and he did not consider that there would be any additional noise. He said that the hours of play in the play area could be restricted through the use of lockable gates if a permission was so conditioned. With regard to noise, he said he had received complaints on only one occasion when a steel band had played a charity event at the site, and he had apologised to Mr and Mrs Plank on that occasion. The only other complaints had been received when he had renewed the entertainment licence shortly after taking over the premises.

The Head of Development Management then clarified that irrespective of whether complaints had been received in the past, Members had to decide whether there was likely to be a loss of amenity to residents due to noise if the application were approved. She also noted that the proposed children's play area was on the site of the consented golf course, with permission for the tennis courts being granted on land behind the hedge fronting the highway.

Members then descended the steps to view the southern elevation of the clubhouse from the lower level before proceeding to the site of the second application.

4. NP/11/180 – Stationing of 8 Lodges, Meadow House Holiday Park, Summerhill, Amroth

The Head of Development Management explained that this was a full application for 8 lodges, rather than a change of use application, and the description would be amended. She noted that since writing the report for the Development Management Committee on the 15th June 2011 a recommendation of refusal had been received from the Highway Authority due to the provision of inadequate parking, although the Environment Agency had no objection to the proposals. She then drew Members' attention to Policy 38 of the Local Development Plan which resisted increases in the number of pitches on caravan sites, although exceptionally they could be enlarged where this would achieve an overall environmental improvement. Officers did not consider that the current application would lead to such an improvement but would be detrimental to the special qualities of the National Park. Additionally insufficient information had been provided with regard to coal mining and because of these reasons, the application was recommended for refusal.

Statutory Consultees were then invited to address the Committee, beginning with Mr Mike Harris, the Highway Officer. He stated that the parking for the lodges was shown in the corner of the site, but he believed this was on land already used for staff parking and more space was therefore needed. A further reason for refusal related to the means of mitigation for the increase in traffic, ie the roundabout, not being included within the application (although it was clarified by the Head of



Development Management that a requirement for those works, if granted under NP/10/451, to be carried out prior to any other development, could be included on any consent as a Grampian Condition provided that the applicant had control of the relevant land). Mr Harris admitted that these matters could be addressed; however until they had been, a recommendation of refusal was appropriate.

Ms Sian Luke from the Environment Agency then spoke. She believed that while there was some concern regarding the foul drainage from the lodges, a solution could be found if the scheme were approved and this would lead to betterment of the provision over the whole site. They had therefore not objected to the application.

The Agent was then invited to address the Committee. He began by saying that the application for eight lodges would not lead to an increase in numbers on the site as the replacement of 55 touring caravans with 47 static caravans granted at the previous meeting of the Authority had resulted in a decrease of eight units, which was the number proposed on this site. Parking had been positioned to one side of the lodges and it was hoped that agreement could be reached with the Highway Authority on this matter. Similarly he believed agreement could be reached with the Environment Agency over foul drainage.

Mrs Lewis from Amroth Community Council again spoke in support of the application, stating that this was a secluded site and the Council wished to encourage visitors to the village in the hope that this would increase custom for local businesses.

The objectors were then invited to speak. Mr Holden again spoke on behalf of a number of residents. He said he had spoken to the former owner of the site who had confirmed that work had never started on the 1986 application for tennis courts and a golf course and the track had existed previously. He had stated that when he had left in 1997, the site was a green field that could be mown. Mr Holden also expressed the concerns of Mr & Mrs Banner, who lived adjacent to the site of the proposed sewerage works, that the waste water could only go down into their garden and that solid waste would have to be removed through the use of a lorry parked on the narrow public highway. He concluded by stating that there would be both noise and visual intrusion from the proposed lodges.

Members then asked questions regarding the existing screen of large mature trees and about landscaping of the site. The owner explained that the trees would remain and those of a non-native variety could be topped or replanted if so conditioned, but that the hedge also included a number of native trees. Plans for landscaping of the site had been included with the application. With regard to the removal of effluent, Mr Pendleton



clarified that the proposal was for a treatment plant which would negate the need to remove solid waste.

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending the meeting, and informed them that their comments would be taken into consideration when the Committee considered the application further, at the meeting scheduled to be held on the 20th July 2011 at Llanion Park. The Head of Development Management clarified that public speaking would be allowed on application NP/11/180 at that meeting as long as the necessary forms were submitted in time. However no further speakers would be permitted on application NP/10/451 as the opportunity to speak on that application had been provided at the previous meeting of the Committee.

