

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

19th June 2013

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)

Mr A Archer, Councillor JA Brinsden, Mr D Ellis, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor P Harries, Councillor M James, Councillor L Jenkins, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor A Lee, Councillor RM Lewis, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Mr EA Sangster and Councillor M Williams.

(Cleddau Bridge Hotel, Pembroke Dock: 10:00am – 11:40am)

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Hudson, Councillor D Rees and Mrs M Thomas.

2. 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>Minutes 8(a) below</i> NP/13/0093 Land Adjoining Brooklands, Saundersfoot	Councillor RM Lewis	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minute 8(g) below</i> NP/13/0176 Stackpole Quay Farm, Stackpole Quay Road, Stackpole	Mr D Ellis	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minute 8(g) below</i> NP/13/0176 Stackpole Quay Farm, Stackpole Quay Road, Stackpole	Councillor A Lee	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 22nd May 2013 and 3rd June 2013 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd May 2013 and 3rd June 2013 be confirmed and signed.



4. **Matters Arising**

Minute 7(b) (22nd May 2013) NP/13/0071 St Catherines Island & fort, Castle Beach, Tenby

At the previous meeting of the Committee, it was resolved that Members proceed with a site visit to the Island on 3rd June or the nearest possible date thereafter. The Head of Development Management reported that the advice of an independent Health and Safety Assessor had been sought with regard to the visit and had advised that in order for Members to visit safely, work would need to be carried out on the Island at a likely cost of £600 - £1000. Therefore it had been concluded that it was not possible for Members to visit the site. However officers had taken numerous photographs and the applicant had produced a video to illustrate his proposals. These would be shown when the application was discussed.

NOTED.

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. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7th December 2011, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak (*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/12/0477 <i>Minute 8(b) refers</i>	Construction of a Dormer Cottage – Plot 1 off Blockett Lane, Little Haven	Andrew Vaughan Harries, Agent
NP/12/0478 <i>Minute 8(c) refers</i>	Construction of a Dormer Cottage – Plot 2 off Blockett Lane, Little Haven	Andrew Vaughan Harries, Agent
NP/12/0480 <i>Minute 8(d) refers</i>	Construction of a Dormer Cottage – Plot 4 off Blockett Lane, Little Haven	Andrew Vaughan Harries, Agent
NP/13/0134 <i>Minute 8(e) refers</i>	Outline application for 1 x 3 bedroom, 1.5 storey house, with consideration of access and layout (all other matters reserved) – Plot between Cartref and Fernlea, Nolton	James Owen, applicant



Haven

NP/01/0187 <i>Minute 8(h) refers</i>	Construction of a shed for the storage of boats, garden & maintenance equipment ancillary to the use of Sarah's Cottage and The Bungalow as holiday lets, including the extension of the curtilage of Sarah's Cottage to include the proposed structure – Musselwick Bungalow, St Ishmaels	Mr David Warren-Davis
---	--	-----------------------

6. Planning Applications received since the last meeting

Details of applications 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 were reported to members for information. Members were informed that of the 40 applications covered by the report, 10 had been found to be invalid.

NOTED

7. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system and stated that planning decisions had to be made in accordance with statutory provisions and the adopted Local Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. It stressed that non-material considerations had to be disregarded when taking planning decisions and stated that personal circumstances were only very rarely material to planning decisions. Provided members applied the Planning Acts lawfully and in a fair and impartial manner they would also comply with the Authority's duties under the Human Rights Act 1998 insofar as it applies to planning decisions. It was also important that Members applied the guidance contained in the Authority's Planning Code of Good Practice while carrying out their statutory duties.

NOTED

8. Report on Planning Applications

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Head of Development Management, 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*):



[Councillor RM Lewis disclosed an interest in the following application and withdrew from the meeting while it was considered]

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/13/0093
APPLICANT: Mr I Westley, Pembrokeshire County Council
PROPOSAL: Construction of Civic Amenity & recycling centre incorporating an internal access road, site access improvements, erection of a compactor shed, canopy shed & welfare office, provision of containers, skips & igloos, staff & visitor parking, weighbridge area and quarantine area, lighting & site signage, fencing & landscaping works
LOCATION: Land adjoining Brooklands, Saundersfoot

The Head of Development Management reported that the application had been withdrawn at 7pm the previous evening and she read the letter she had received from the County Council's Agent in full. She also advised that she had informed the Chair and had contacted objectors the previous evening to try to ensure that as many people as possible were aware that the application would not be determined that day. Members of the Committee were not happy at the late withdrawal of the application, due to the inconvenience caused to those who had intended attending the meeting to make representations and the wasted cost to the Authority of hiring a larger venue due to the public interest in this application. In noting the withdrawal of the application Members also expressed their appreciation of the clear and rigorous report which had been prepared by the case officer.

NOTED.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/12/0477
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs K & R Holmes
PROPOSAL: Construction of dormer cottage
LOCATION: Plot 1, Off Blockett Lane, Little Haven

Members were reminded that this, together with three related applications, had been the subject of a site inspection carried out by the Committee in January 2013. At the subsequent meeting of the Committee held on 23rd January, it was reported that it had been found through a land registry search, that the ownership certificates for the four applications submitted at that time might be incorrect and the legal advice was that the determination of the applications should not proceed until the situation had been clarified. Since that time further legal advice had ascertained that the certificates in respect of the above mentioned application were correct and as such the application could now be determined.



It was reported that this was a full application for a single dwelling on part of a larger site that had originally been designated as an Environmental Improvement Area under the Local Plan. However in the current Local Development Plan, the designation of the site as such had been removed, and it was now considered as a brownfield site in the open countryside.

Development of the larger site had been separated into three areas, with the southernmost area already having been developed for two large contemporary designed houses. The land to the north had full planning permission for six dwellings – a terrace of three and three detached houses with three of the total provision being affordable housing. The remaining land, the central part of the site, was the subject of the current application for a single dwelling, plus three further applications each for a detached dwelling, one of which was refused by the Committee at its meeting in May, and the other two would be considered by the Committee that day (*Minutes 8(c) and 8(d) refer*).

The application on Plot 1 was for a traditionally designed one-and-a-half-storey dwelling located to the north of the existing site access and over the existing access track to the site, necessitating the creation of a new access and associated road to service Plots 2, 3 and 4. Officers were concerned at the succession of accesses that would be created and the resultant loss of hedgerow and considered that the proposal was harmful to the special qualities of the National Park in that it failed to harmonise with the landscape character of the area and resulted in the loss of important traditional features. This formed the first reason for refusal of the application.

The second reason for refusal related to the lack of provision for affordable housing. The Authority's policy required 50% affordable housing to meet an identified need in developments of 2 or more residential units. As this application, even though it was for a single dwelling, was part of a larger site, the policy still applied. This was to ensure that sites were not broken up into smaller portions and phased in order to avoid the requirement for affordable housing. As such the provision of a commuted sum was not acceptable and the proposal was contrary to adopted Development Plan policy.

It was reported at the meeting that a response had now been received from the Highway Authority objecting to the application on two grounds. Firstly, that the development would result in an unnecessary proliferation of vehicular access points onto a country road where visibility was restricted, 2-way traffic was required to share the single lane and where



there was no refuge for vulnerable road users. This formed the third reason for refusal. Secondly, that the need for vehicles arriving and leaving the property to manoeuvre within the highway to gain access and egress to the parking spaces created a potential hazard to other road users, particularly when reversing. This formed the fourth reason for refusal.

Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries, the agent, then addressed the Committee. He explained that this was a brownfield site, upon which the principle of development was acceptable, as was the design. He pointed out that the Highway Authority had previously recommended conditional approval of development on the site in 2005 and 2010. With regard to the separate access to Plot 1, he stated that this was possibly an oversight by the Architect, as the access for the Plot could come off the main access to the site. He stated that it was wrong to say that there would be multiple accesses as his client would be closing up an access with poor visibility and relocating it further down the lane.

With regard to the affordable housing requirement, Mr Vaughan-Harries stated that the land was in separate ownerships and each applicant wished to do something different. A commuted sum had been offered in place of affordable housing, and he considered that as the deliverability of affordable housing was becoming harder, this would provide a way to kick-start development.

Members sought clarification on the number of accesses that would exist, and the Planning Officer explained that there would be four: an existing access to the south of plot 1, the proposed access to Plot 1, the proposed estate road for Plots 2 to 4 and finally the existing access for the permitted six dwellings. Three of these accesses would be within a 50 metres stretch.

Members also sought clarification on the requirement for affordable housing and the appropriateness of a commuted sum. The Planning Officer replied by reading footnote 145 of the Local Development Plan in relation to larger sites. This meant that landownership was irrelevant as the four plots formed part of a larger site which was for more than 2 units and the affordable housing policy therefore applied. The Head of Development Management added that discussions had been held over many years regarding the need for affordable housing on the site, and that the applicants had provided no indication that there was a viability issue with regard to its provision.

One Member was unconvinced by the highway objections on what he described as a small lane, however most Members were clear that the application should be refused for the reasons set out in the report and



reported orally and particularly the highway objections. Members hoped that the applicants would carry out further discussions with officers with a view to completing the development of the site in the future.

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

- 1. Policies 8, 15, 29 and 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seek to protect and enhance the pattern and diversity of the landscape, prevent development that fails to harmonise with or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park, that fails to incorporate important traditional features, and that is insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape and visually intrusive. The proposed access for the dwelling, the resulting loss of existing hedgerow, and the cumulative impact of existing and other proposed accesses in the near vicinity, results in the loss of a traditional landscape feature and the rural character of the area, and is therefore insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape. The proposal is considered to be harmful to the special qualities of the National Park and contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.**
- 2. Policies 7 and 45 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan require the provision of 50% affordable housing to meet the identified need in developments of 2 or more units. Footnote 145 of the Local Development Plan states that where a planning application is received for a site below the affordable housing threshold but which is part of a larger site which is above the threshold then affordable housing will be expected. The application forms part of a large site on which 50% provision of affordable housing will be sought. As neither this application nor the others submitted on the remainder of this large site proposes the required two affordable dwellings, the proposal is considered contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.**
- 3. Policies 52 and 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan relate to sustainable transport and the impacts of traffic, and seek to ensure that proposals are resisted which cause significant concerns about potential transport impacts and where access has an unacceptable impact on road safety or causes environmental damage. The proposal would result in an unnecessary proliferation of vehicular access points onto the county road at a location where visibility is restricted, two way traffic is required to share the single lane, and where there is no refuge for vulnerable road users. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to adopted development plan policy.**



4. **Policies 52 and 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan relate to sustainable transport and the impacts of traffic and seek to ensure that proposals are resisted which cause significant concerns about potential transport impacts and where access has an unacceptable impact on road safety or cause environmental damage. Vehicles arriving and leaving the property would be required to manoeuvre within the highway to gain access and egress to the parking spaces creating a potential hazard to other road users, particularly when reversing. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to adopted development plan policy.**

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/12/0478
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs N Davies
PROPOSAL: Construction of a dormer cottage
LOCATION: Plot 2, Off Blockett Lane, Little Haven

Members were reminded that this, together with three related applications, had been the subject of a site inspection carried out by the Committee in January 2013. At the subsequent meeting of the Committee held on 23rd January, it was reported that it had been found through a land registry search, that the ownership certificates for the four applications submitted at that time might be incorrect and the legal advice was that the determination of the applications should not proceed until the situation had been clarified. Since that time further legal advice had ascertained that the certificates in respect of the above-mentioned application were correct and as such it could now be determined.

It was reported that this was a traditionally designed one-and-a-half-storey dwelling and the application also sought permission for the associated access and internal estate distributor road. As described in the application on Plot 1 (*Minute 8(b) refers*) this application formed part of a larger site, part of which had already been developed and part of which had planning permission. This application was one of four applications on the remainder of the site, two of which had been refused by the Committee, one at its meeting in May, and one earlier in the meeting (*Minute 8(b) refers*). The final application was also due to be considered by the Committee that day (*Minute 8(d) refers*).

The application was for a traditionally designed dwelling, however this was recommended for refusal for three reasons. Firstly the cumulative impact of existing and other proposed accesses in the near vicinity which would result in the loss of a traditional hedgerow and the rural character of the area and was therefore considered to be harmful to the special qualities of the National Park. Secondly the lack of affordable housing



provision contrary to the Authority's policy which required 50% provision, amounting to two dwellings, as this was part of a larger site.

It was reported at the meeting that a final reason for refusal was due to the objection of the Highway Authority on the grounds that the development would result in an unnecessary proliferation of vehicular access points onto a country road where visibility was restricted, 2-way traffic was required to share the single lane and where there was no refuge for vulnerable road users.

The Agent, Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries, again addressed the Committee. He strongly disagreed that there was a proliferation of accesses and explained that the existing access was unsafe as no right turn could be made from it. A replacement access was therefore proposed.

The Planning Officer replied maintaining that the Highway Authority had stated that the development should be served off the existing access, but that the wall that had been built had to be removed. She added that this current access could not be blocked up as it served existing dwellings.

Members considered that there were overwhelming reasons for refusal..

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

- 1. Policies 8, 15, 29 and 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seek to protect and enhance the pattern and diversity of the landscape, prevent development that fails to harmonise with or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park, that fails to incorporate important traditional features, and that is insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape and visually intrusive. The proposed access for the dwelling, the resulting loss of existing hedgerow, and the cumulative impact of existing and other proposed accesses in the near vicinity, results in the loss of a traditional landscape feature and the rural character of the area, and is therefore insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape. The proposal is considered to be harmful to the special qualities of the National Park and contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.**
- 2. Policies 7 and 45 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan require the provision of 50% affordable housing to meet the identified need in developments of 2 or more units. Footnote 145 of the Local Development Plan states that where a planning application is received for a site below the affordable**



housing threshold but which is part of a larger site which is above the threshold then affordable housing will be expected. The application forms part of a large site on which 50% provision of affordable housing will be sought. As neither this application nor the others submitted on the remainder of this large site proposes the required two affordable dwellings the proposal is considered contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.

- 3. Policies 52 and 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan relate to sustainable transport and the impacts of traffic, and seek to ensure that proposals are resisted which cause significant concerns about potential transport impacts and where access has an unacceptable impact on road safety or causes environmental damage. The proposal would result in an unnecessary proliferation of vehicular access points onto the county road at a location where visibility is restricted, two way traffic is required to share the single lane, and where there is no refuge for vulnerable road users. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to adopted development plan policy.**

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/12/0480
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs G Hutton
PROPOSAL: Construction of single dwelling
LOCATION: Plot 4, Blockett Lane, Little Haven

As with the previous two applications, Members were reminded that this, together with three related applications, had been the subject of a site inspection carried out by the Committee in January 2013. At the subsequent meeting of the Committee held on 23rd January, it was reported that it had been found through a land registry search, that the ownership certificates for the four applications submitted at that time might be incorrect and the legal advice was that the determination of the applications should not proceed until the situation had been clarified. Since that time further legal advice had ascertained that the certificates in respect of the application were correct and as such the application could now be determined.

This was the final application on land off Blockett Lane (*Minutes 8 (b) and (c) refer*) that formed part of a larger site, part of which had already been developed and part of which had planning permission. The proposal sought permission for a detached two-storey dwelling together with associated access and internal estate distributor road. The two storey part of the dwelling would be constructed of horizontal timber cladding under a metal clad roof. The rest of the house would be one-and-a-half storeys in height and constructed of random stone under a slate roof.



The application was recommended for refusal, again due to the cumulative impact of existing and proposed accesses harming the special qualities of the National Park and the non-provision of affordable housing contrary to the Authority's policy. However there were also problems with the amenity of the potential occupiers of the properties already granted permission on the adjacent area of the site as the proposed dwelling, being at a higher level, would look directly into habitable room windows at both ground and first floor level. This therefore formed an additional reason for refusal.

It was reported at the meeting that a final reason for refusal resulted from the objection of the Highway Authority on the grounds that the development would result in an unnecessary proliferation of vehicular access points onto a country road where visibility was restricted, 2-way traffic was required to share the single lane and where there was no refuge for vulnerable road users.

The agent for the application, Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries, again addressed the Committee. He informed Members that his client had had discussions with officers regarding the delivery of affordable housing on the site and this issue would hopefully be addressed if a further application was submitted. With regard to overlooking, Mr Vaughan-Harries expressed some frustration with the Authority's policy of not accepting amendments to applications once they had been validated as this issue could have been resolved.

The Head of Development Management replied that the policy was in place as the need to re-consult on applications added confusion as well as causing delay to their determination. Generally, any amendments that were so minor that they did not trigger new consultations and which were received within 8 weeks could be accepted. This was not considered to be applicable in this instance.

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

- 1. Policies 8, 15, 29 and 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seek to protect and enhance the pattern and diversity of the landscape, prevent development that fails to harmonise with or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park, that fails to incorporate important traditional features, and that is insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape and visually intrusive. The proposed access for the dwelling, the resulting loss of existing hedgerow, and the cumulative impact of existing and other proposed accesses in the near vicinity, results in the loss of a traditional landscape feature and the rural character of the area, and is therefore insensitively and**



unsympathetically sited within the landscape. The proposal is considered to be harmful to the special qualities of the National Park and contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.

2. **Policy 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan states that development will not be permitted where it has an unacceptable impact on amenity. The proposed dwelling by virtue of its elevated position and proximity to permitted dwellings, is considered to result in an unacceptable level of overlooking, and consequential loss of privacy. The proposal is therefore contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.**
3. **Policies 7 and 45 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan require the provision of 50% affordable housing to meet the identified need in developments of 2 or more units. Footnote 145 of the Local Development Plan states that where a planning application is received for a site below the affordable housing threshold but which is part of a larger site which is above the threshold then affordable housing will be expected. The application forms part of a large site on which 50% provision of affordable housing will be sought. As neither this application nor the others submitted on the remainder of this large site proposes the required two affordable dwellings the proposal is considered contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.**
4. **Policies 52 and 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan relate to sustainable transport and the impacts of traffic, and seek to ensure that proposals are resisted which cause significant concerns about potential transport impacts and where access has an unacceptable impact on road safety or causes environmental damage. The proposal would result in an unnecessary proliferation of vehicular access points onto the county road at a location where visibility is restricted, two way traffic is required to share the single lane, and where there is no refuge for vulnerable road users. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to adopted development plan policy.**



- (e) REFERENCE: NP/13/0134
APPLICANT: Mr J Owen
PROPOSAL: Outline application for 1x3 bedroom, 1.5 storey house, with consideration of access and layout (all other matters reserved)
LOCATION: Plot between Cartref & Fernlea, Nolton Haven

This outline application proposed the erection of a detached one and a half storey dwelling, with consideration at this stage of access and layout only. Officers had carefully considered the proposal against all material considerations and the relevant national and local development plan policies. On balance the application was recommended for refusal for four reasons.

The first of these was that a one and half storey dwelling had been proposed in an area of single storey dwellings, which was harmful to the special qualities of the National Park. The second was due to the limited transport accessibility of this open market dwelling, which was contrary to Policy 7 of the Local Development Plan. The third reason was that the application had not been supported with sufficient information to ascertain the impact of the coal mining legacy on the proposed development. The final reason was that the applicant had not agreed to provide the prescribed level of commuted sum for affordable housing - £100 had been offered instead of the required £150 per square metre. As such the application was considered contrary to adopted development plan policy, and harmful to the special qualities of the National Park and was recommended for refusal.

The applicant, Mr Owen, then spoke, explaining that he was 26 years old and wanted to move out from home. As he worked in the family business within the village, he wanted to stay within the village, however other houses for sale were very expensive. This was his opportunity to get on the housing ladder. With regard to the accessibility issue, he explained that he never had and never would use the bus and would in any case be walking to work. Regarding the affordable housing payment he commented that there was only so much that he was able to afford as a contribution, and noted that 3 affordable houses were being built nearby. He considered that it was better to support a local lad, as a lot of his friends had had to move away, however he had stayed and had built up the businesses.

Members asked whether any negotiation had taken place with regard to the affordable housing element of the application, and officers replied that an identical application had been withdrawn in November 2012 and at that time the applicant had been advised of the level of contribution set out in the Supplementary Planning Guidance. No evidence had been received



from the applicant indicating that this level was not viable for the site. Some concern was also expressed with regard to the application of the accessibility policy and the Head of Development Management pointed out that a recent appeal decision (reported separately later in today's agenda) had supported the policy and warned that personal circumstances should rarely be given weight to overturn its application.

There was also some discussion regarding the need for a Coal Authority Risk Assessment report, particularly when outline permission had been granted in 2008. Officers replied that the legislation had changed on this point, and such survey was now required by the Coal Authority due to the safety risk.

Members agreed that a single storey property was the appropriate form of development on this site..

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

- 1. Policy 7 of the Pembrokeshire Coast Local Development Plan states that development will only be permitted where it constitutes sensitive infilling to isolated groups of dwellings, and that the release of land will depend on the character of the surroundings and the pattern of development in the area. Policies 8, 15, 29 and 30 of the Local Development Plan seek to protect and enhance the pattern and diversity of the landscape, the identity of towns and villages, and prevent development that is insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape and visually intrusive. The proposed dwelling, by reason of its height and one-and-a-half-storey character in a location within the hamlet where all other properties are single storey, is considered to be visually intrusive and unacceptable infilling that is harmful to the character of the hamlet and the special qualities of the National Park. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to adopted Development Plan policy.**
- 2. Policy 7 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan states that that development will only be permitted where it constitutes sensitive infilling to isolated groups of dwellings, and that the release of land will depend on the character of the surroundings and the pattern of development in the area. Priority will be given to meet affordable housing needs, and the release of land will depend on the character of the surroundings, the pattern of development in the area and the accessibility to the Centres. There is insufficient year-round public transport provision to provide an alternative to the private car for an open market dwelling. This lack of accessibility and the resulting reliance on the**



private car means that the proposal is contrary to Policy 7 of the adopted Development Plan.

3. **Planning Policy Wales (Chapter 13) states that the responsibility and subsequent liability for safe development in areas of unstable ground rests with the developer and landowner. Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Land Instability - Former Coal Workings requires the submission of a Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report for development within Coal Mining Referral Areas. The application lies within a Coal Mining Referral Area and has not been supported with a Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report. Consequently the impact of the coal mining legacy on the proposed development cannot be assessed including whether any mitigation measures are necessary to address any issues of land instability. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to adopted Development Plan policy.**

4. **Policies 7 and 45 state that a commuted sum will be sought for the delivery of affordable housing on housing developments below the threshold of 2 units (i.e. on proposals for single residential units). The adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance states that a figure of £150 per square metre is required. The proposal fails to provide the required level of commuted sum, and is therefore contrary to adopted development plan policy and its supporting Supplementary Planning Guidance.**

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/13/0174
APPLICANT: Mr W Davies
PROPOSAL: Installation of 50kw wind turbine (25.25m to blade tip) and associated infrastructure
LOCATION: Penrallt Ddu, Pontfaen

It was reported at the meeting that this application had been withdrawn.

NOTED.

[Mr D Ellis disclosed an interest and withdrew from the meeting while the following item NP/13/0176 was discussed. Councillor A Lee realised during the presentation that she also had an interest in the application and also withdrew from the meeting.]



- (g) REFERENCE: NP/13/0176
APPLICANT: Mr C James, James Bros Enterprise Ltd
PROPOSAL: Demolition of timber frame cow kennels & construction on site of portal frame cattle housing building
LOCATION: Stackpole Quay Farm, Stackpole Quay Road, Stackpole

This planning application was reported to the Committee as it involved a major development (a building in excess of 1000 square metres). The nature of the proposal, however, would not require an Environment Impact Assessment as it did not comprise development falling within Schedules 1 or 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999.

It was reported that the existing buildings, which had reached the end of their life, lay in an isolated setting on the western flank of the rural road leading to Stackpole Quay, and east of Stackpole village. The new building would be sited on the footprint of the existing cow kennels within a farmyard setting and would be accessed by the existing entrance to the site. The design was typically agricultural in appearance and form, and, whilst sizeable in scale, the structure replaced existing buildings and was considered necessary for the purposes of that enterprise. As the proposed building was longer and taller than the existing structures, there was a balance to be considered between the provision of a replacement building on an existing agricultural site, and the visual impact of a taller building on the surrounding landscape setting. However the overall appearance of the structure would be a visual improvement to that of the existing cow kennels and adjacent sheds.

On balance, therefore, it was considered that the replacement building could be supported as it would relate to an existing farm enterprise and would lead to an improvement when compared to the state of the existing structures, and the recommendation was one of approval.

In considering the impact of the proposed replacement building in the landscape, Members asked about its height, colour of the roofing material and external lighting, as well as disposal of slurry. Officers replied that the building would be approximately 2m higher to allow for access by modern farm machinery and the roof would be of sinusoidal sheeting which was normally light grey in colour. Lighting and slurry disposal could be controlled by conditions. Members asked that officers advise the applicant on the most appropriate colour for the roofing material so as to minimise intrusion.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to standard conditions relating to time, compliance with submitted plans,



landscaping, external colours, submission of a lighting scheme and conditions recommended by statutory consultees.

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/13/0187
APPLICANT: Rev L Richards
PROPOSAL: Construction of a shed for the storage of boats, garden & maintenance equipment ancillary to the use of Sarah's Cottage and The Bungalow as holiday lets, including the extension of the curtilage of Sarah's Cottage to include the proposed structure
LOCATION: Musselwick Bungalow, St Ishmaels

It was reported that the site was located within an area excavated from the cliff and adjacent to the end of Sarah's Cottage garden area. The site was believed to have housed a two storey boat house until approximately 1950s when it was destroyed in storms. The application sought approval to construct a two storey structure to provide boat storage on the lower storey and general storage of garden and other equipment on the upper storey. The structure would have a traditional form with a natural slate pitch roof over local red sandstone together with oak timber boarded panels.

The proposed change of use and extension of curtilage was considered to be appropriate in this instance and could be supported. The scheme for the proposed new storage building was also considered to be acceptable and had a scale, mass, form and detailed design which was in-keeping with the host property and also with the proposed use of the building. The appearance and location of the new landscaping would ensure that the visual amenities of the existing site would be improved without having an adverse impact on neighbouring properties and the surrounding area. The proposal would also maintain the special qualities of the National Park when viewed from the immediate and wider landscape. As such the proposal could be supported subject to appropriate conditions.

At the meeting, a late letter from the applicant was circulated in response to objections and Members were given 5 minutes in which to read it. They sought clarification regarding the current status of the proposed designation of a Marine Conservation Zone at Dale and were advised by officers that they were not aware the proposal had been dropped and that it was still under consideration by the Welsh Government..

It was also reported that since writing the report, consultation responses had been received from Dyfed Archaeological Trust and Natural Resources Wales, both of which raised no objections to the proposal.

An objector, Mr David Warren-Davies, then addressed the Committee.



He explained that he was the current incumbent of what remained of the Warren-Davies Estate and circulated a note setting out his objections to the proposal. He explained that the former boathouse was used in the 1950s as storage for his father's fishing boat. He asserted that the applicant did not have any right to cross the coastal strip and that thousands of tons of rock would need to be excavated if he were to do so.

One Member noted that St Ishmaels Community Council had objected to the proposal and wished to support their position. He considered the design of the boathouse to be inappropriate, considering that it would be more in keeping on the banks of the River Thames and proposed that the application be refused. This was then seconded.

Another Member sought clarification on the issues of landownership raised by the objector. Officers replied that the necessary land ownership certificates had been submitted and that they were supported by information from the land registry confirming ownership of the application site. The officer also explained that he understood only a small amount of excavation would be necessary in the garden area to accommodate a garden path approximately 1.2m deep over a short distance. The same Member took the opposite view from the proposer of the amendments to refuse, considering that the site was well hidden, being visible only from the shoreline, and that the building would be attractive in the setting, resembling buildings which would have been found around estate houses in the past. He proposed approval of the application and this was also seconded.

A vote was taken on the amendment, to refuse the application, and this was lost 5 votes to 8. A vote was then taken on the substantive motion to approve the application subject to conditions and this was carried 9 votes to 5.

DECISION: That Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions relating to timing of the works within five years and in accordance with the approved plans, linking the application with Sarah's Cottage, restricting its use as ancillary storage only with no living accommodation allowed, restricting storage of material and construction traffic away from the foreshore and within the garden of Sarah's Cottage only. Further details of the method of protection for the adjacent trees and hedges during construction and further details on location and sizes of proposed landscaping would be required together with details of external colours to be agreed with the Authority prior to the commencement of works on site.

[Councillor M Williams tendered his apologies and then left the meeting during the following item]



9. Appeals

The Head of Development Management reported on 11 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.

With regard to the decision at Taskers Garden, Opposite the Smithy, West Williamston, the Head of Development Management highlighted the Inspector's support for the Authority's policy which required the consideration of the accessibility of the site to recognised centres and the need for Travel Plans submitted as part of a planning application to be enforceable in perpetuity.

NOTED.

10. Delegated applications/notifications

41 applications/notifications had been dealt with 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. Of the 41, it was reported that 2 applications had been refused and 4 withdrawn.

NOTED.

