

REPORT OF HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT ON APPEALS

The following appeals have been lodged with the Authority and the current position of each is as follows:-

NP/08/434 Enlargement of existing hay barn, erection of cattle shed, yard and pigsties and formation of hedgebanks and provision of slurry tanks - Llethyr, Cwm Gwaun
Type Hearing
Current Position The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector and a Hearing has been arranged for 8th November, 2012

NP/11/497 Outline application for erection of 3-bedroomed house with approval sought for access and layout - Land Adjacent to 7 Walton Hill, Little Haven, Haverfordwest.
Type Hearing
Current Position The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector .and a Hearing has been arranged for the 13th November, 2012.

NP/11/531 Demolition of building, ground and first floor flats, & replacing with two houses - Ground and First Floor Flats, 6, Panteg Road, Solva,
Type Written Representation
Current Position The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector.

NP/12/0134 Change of use to residential - Natural Healthcare Centre, 17 Long Street, Newport
Type Written Representations
Current Position The appeal has been dismissed and a copy of the decision notice is attached for your information.

NP/12/0209 Agricultural workshop/store associated with the Long Barn units & smallholding(retrospective) – Garden/Paddock area of The Long Barns, Lochvane
Type Written Representations
Current Position The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector.

NP/12/0230 Low Impact Development on 6 hectares to include dwelling, an agricultural barn, an education room, a polytunnel and volunteer sleeping space
Type Hearing
Current Position The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector.

EC06/137 Siting of two shipping containers - Blaenafon, Mill Lane, Newport
Type Written Representation
Current Position Awaiting Inspectors Decision.

considering new uses for a redundant employment site priority is given to community facilities or affordable housing.

5. By adding to the mix and diversity of retail, commercial and business uses that can be found within Newport's shopping centre, the existing ground floor use attracts customers who would be likely to make linked trips to other business in the vicinity. It therefore adds to the vitality, viability and attractiveness of the centre. Other uses that fall within the use classes permitted by LDP Policy 50 would have a similar effect. The proposed residential use, which would fall within use class C3, would however not attract shoppers or visitors to other facilities within Newport. The proposed change of use would therefore be harmful to the vitality, viability and attractiveness of the centre. It would conflict in this respect with the land use priorities identified in LDP Policy 3(d), and the intent and specific requirements of LDP Policy 50(a). These policies are consistent with national development control policies set out in Section 10 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW).
6. The appellant has been trying to sell the business as a going concern through advertisements in specialist journals since at least July 2010. A firm of Estate Agents have also been marketing the business and premises since the summer of 2011 without success. I accept that the commercial market during this period has been very depressed and there are other commercial properties in Newport that have not sold. However, on the limited information provided to me the marketing appears to have been focussed largely on the existing business. The premises do not appear to have been well promoted for other suitable uses that would be permitted by Policy 50. Nor do they appear to have been offered on a rental or leasehold basis. Whilst I understand the appellant's need to realise the capital investment in the property to fund an impending move abroad, on the basis of the limited marketing exercise that has been undertaken I do not consider that it has been demonstrated that commercial use is not viable. As the proposed change of use would also result in the loss of employment opportunities, I further conclude that the proposed development would also conflict with LDP Policy 42.
7. The proposed change of use would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There would therefore be no conflict with planning policy in this respect, but the effect would be broadly neutral. The proposal would add to the amount of market housing in the area, but I give little weight to the argument that there would be benefits in terms of affordable housing elsewhere, as financial contributions cannot be required by conditions and no legally binding undertaking to make such a contribution is offered. On the evidence before me I do not consider that there would be benefits to matters of public interest that would outweigh the harm and conflict with planning policy that I have identified. Nor do I consider that the proposed a change of use has been justified.
8. I have taken into account all other material considerations that have been raised, but find nothing to turn me from the conclusion that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan for the area, or that would indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A D Poulter

INSPECTOR