

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

18<sup>th</sup> June 2014

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)

Mr D Ellis, Councillor P Harries, Councillor S Hudson, Councillor M James, Councillor O James, Councillor L Jenkins, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor RM Lewis, Councillor R Owens, Councillor D Rees, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor M Williams.

*[Ms C Gwyther arrived during consideration of Item 4, Applications received since the last meeting, Minute 5 refers]*

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 12.25pm]

## 1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Mr A Archer, Councillor PJ Morgan and Mrs M Thomas.

## 2. Disclosures of interest

There were no disclosures of interest.

## 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 21<sup>st</sup> May 2014 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 21<sup>st</sup> May 2014 be confirmed and signed.

**NOTED.**

## 4. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011, 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/140/0143 <i>Minute 7(d) refers</i>	Installation of Pay & Display Machine & Associated Signage - National Trust Car Park, Marloes, Haverfordwest	Mrs YC Evans, Marloes & St Brides Community Council



NP/14/0184 <i>Minute 7(f) refers</i>	A 'Solar Hamlet' comprised of 2 detached & 4 semi-detached Ty Solar type houses - Land adjacent to Glanrhyd House, Glanrhyd, Nevern	Mr Peters, applicant
NP/14/0236 <i>Minute 7(h) Refers</i>	Residential development of 8 properties including 4 affordable apartments - Land at Blockett Farm, Blockett Lane, Little Haven	Mr A Vaughan-Harries, Agent

*[Ms C Gwyther arrived during consideration of the following item]*

## **5. 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 40 applications were, therefore, reported for information and Members were informed that 16 were deemed to be invalid.

The Head of Development Management went on to note that in the new Calendar of Meetings which would begin after that day's meeting, the Committee would meet at six-weekly, rather than monthly, intervals. She therefore considered that there would be little benefit in reproducing this list of applications for future meetings as a number of the applications would have already been determined before the Committee met. The 'weekly list' of submitted applications would continue to be circulated electronically, and the procedures for Members to request that applications be brought before the Committee would continue to apply. Members asked if it were feasible for determined applications to be included on the electronic list and the Head of Development Management agreed to explore whether this would be possible. It was agreed that the list of determined applications would also no longer be included in the agenda to reduce publication costs.

## **NOTED**

## **6. 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**

### **7. Report of 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*):

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/13/0448  
APPLICANT: Mr John Collins  
PROPOSAL: New vehicular access and parking  
LOCATION: Fig Tree Cottage, Wogan Lane, Saundersfoot
  
- (b) REFERENCE: NP/13/0480  
APPLICANT: Mr AJ Collins  
PROPOSAL: Discharge a Section 106 Agreement requiring access/parking of vehicles  
LOCATION: Fig Tree Cottage, Wogan Lane, Saundersfoot

It was reported that, as set out in the report, a plan to accompany the S106 Agreement at this property had been requested from the Agent. A response had been received the previous day stating that the Agent was unable to provide a plan as there were discrepancies between the Plan and what was to be found on the ground. Similar discrepancies were also to be found in the planning application which meant that the proposed parking area might not be achievable as intended. In view of these problems, the Head of Development Management stated that it was not proposed to consider the applications that day and they would be reported to a future meeting of the Committee once these issues had been further explored.

## **NOTED.**



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/14/0152  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs G Davies  
PROPOSAL: Exception site for an affordable house (Outline)  
LOCATION: Penberry, Little Haven

Members were reminded that at the May meeting of the Committee it had been resolved to defer consideration of the application so that a site visit could take place to allow Members to better understand the setting of the site and its context. This visit had taken place on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2014.

It was reported that the application was a re-submission following refusal of an almost identical scheme proposing an exception site for an affordable house (outline) within the garden of Penberry. This application was refused by the Authority under delegated powers on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2013. The considerations of the current application remained the same although the applicant had indicated in the submitted Design and Access statement that the revised application incorporated a possible single storey dwelling with only glazed windows on the west elevation, additional planting and/or a timber fence on the western boundary and removal of the static caravan.

The site lay outside the Centre boundary of Little Haven as identified in the adopted Local Development Plan. While there was an identified need for affordable housing in the area, the suitability of the site for housing had previously been considered as part of the Local Development Plan process and not found to be appropriate. Notwithstanding this an assessment of the merits of the scheme had been undertaken taking into account the proposal for an affordable dwelling.

In considering the merits of the scheme, officers considered that the site formed an important setting of mature vegetation with a steep landform outside the Centre Boundary. The development of the site would involve the erosion of these qualities and subsequently impact unacceptably on the character and appearance of the National Park. In addition the relationship between the proposed site and existing residences was considered to be unacceptable in that any dwelling and its subsequent amenity space would result in a loss of privacy and light to existing neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore the access proposed to serve the dwelling was not considered to be acceptable in view of its impact upon and relationship with the existing car park. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

In considering the application, a number of Members highlighted the need for affordable housing in the National Park and considered that the proposal should be supported for that reason. Others added that this dwelling would counterbalance the high proportion of second



homes/holiday lets and contribute to the well-being of Little Haven and also commented that the site was well screened and that there would be little overlooking. It was noted by one member that a caravan was currently located on the site and its replacement with a dwelling would be an improvement. It was moved and seconded that the application be approved.

Other Members, however, while having sympathy with those seeking affordable housing, emphasised the policy position that sites for the exceptional release of land for housing should be adjoining Centre Boundaries. The application site was clearly separated from the Centre Boundary in Little Haven and its approval would set a precedent for other sites similarly removed from Centres across the National Park. Turning to access, particularly for emergency vehicles, there were also concerns that this could be blocked by public parking within the car park.

The Officer clarified for Members that approximately 5m would need to be cut into the steep bank at the rear of the site in order to achieve the indicative layout. The Head of Development Management went on to say that the Authority recognised the need for affordable housing and had issued Supplementary Planning Guidance to address the issue, however she also reiterated the policy position that the exceptional release of land for affordable housing should be within or adjoining the settlement Boundary.

Mr Charles Felgate, the Solicitor advised that the Committee should only deviate from adopted policy when material considerations dictated otherwise and he asked Members to consider what these considerations might be. He also stated that he assumed that the motion for approval of the application would be subject to conditions and noted that if approval were granted it would be subject to a 'cooling off period' which could allow time for both the material considerations and appropriate conditions to be put forward. He also clarified for Members that the lack of rights of access across the car park was a civil matter and not a material planning consideration. Councillor B Kilmister responded that his reason for moving approval contrary to development plan was the acceptability of an exception site close to the settlement boundary with other properties already present.

A vote was then taken on the proposal to approve the application subject to conditions, and this was lost. This was followed by a vote on the proposal to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the report and this was won.

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



- 1. The proposed site by virtue of its location outside a defined Centre boundary and the urbanising impact of the development proposed upon the existing distinctive valley side, which gives a strong sense of place to the village, is not considered to comprise sensitive infilling or rounding off and would be harmful to the character of the area and damaging to the special qualities of the National Park. Whilst a need for affordable housing in the area has been identified this is not considered to be a suitable site for a dwelling house given that the scheme would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), Policy 7 (Countryside), Policy 8 (Special Qualities) (criteria 'a', 'c' and 'd'), Policy 15 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) (criteria 'a', 'b', 'c' and 'd'), Policy 44 – (Housing) and Policy 45 (Affordable Housing) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (Adopted September 2010), Supplementary Planning Guidance - Little Haven Conservation Area Proposals (Adopted 12 October 2011) as well as National Policy contained in Planning Policy Wales (Edition 6, November 2014).**
- 2. The proposed site is at a higher level than the nearest adjoining residences at 'Faulkner' and 'The Dell' and lies in proximity to the private amenity spaces of these properties. As such by virtue of the relationship between the proposed site and the adjoining properties 'Faulkner' and 'The Dell' any proposed dwelling will result in an oppressive, dominant and detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties, with a loss of their amenity and privacy. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy 30 (Amenity) (criteria 'b' and 'd') of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (Adopted September 2010).**
- 3. The proposed access to the site is across an existing car park. The proposed dwelling and its associated vehicular use will result in the loss of two to three existing car parking spaces, result in a higher volume of traffic negotiating through the car park and lead to a potential conflict between users of the proposed dwellinghouse and existing car park. Furthermore there is no future security as to the provision of an access to the dwelling through the Car Park. As such the access proposed is not considered to be appropriate and the traffic and vehicular movements are likely to have an unacceptable impact on the car park and traffic flows at peak times. As such the scheme fails to comply with Policy 53 (Impacts of Traffic) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (Adopted September 2010).**



- (d) REFERENCE: NP/14/0143  
APPLICANT: National Trust  
PROPOSAL: Installation of Pay & Display Machine & Associated Signage  
LOCATION: National Trust Car Park, Marloes, Haverfordwest

This application sought approval for a pay and display machine and an associated tariff signage board to be located in the countryside, within the National Trust Car Park to the west of the village of Marloes. Officers did not consider the proposal to have an adverse impact upon the special qualities of the National Park, or amenity. The application therefore complied with the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan and was recommended for approval.

The application was reported to the Committee as this recommendation was contrary to the view of Marloes and St Brides Community Council who considered that an attendant needed to be on site to control parking in order to allow clear passage through the car park for the existing Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT). The Authority's Rights of Way team had advised that the public right of way was maintained by Pembrokeshire County Council, which would be requested to signpost it to help define the route. It was reported at the meeting that this signposting had now taken place. They had further advised that should the right of way not be kept clear they would request that it was marked on the ground with white lines or similar.

Mrs Evans, the Clerk to the Community Council then addressed the Committee. She drew attention to the position of the Authority as land owner with the car park being leased to the National Trust for a fee and she therefore wished to ensure that the correct procedures had been undertaken. She went on to advise that there had been no problems at the car park due to the presence of an attendant; the official line of the BOAT was along a hedge, however as that was used for parking, a track in the centre of the car park was used. It was essential that this BOAT remained unobstructed particularly for emergency vehicles, which would be more difficult as the bays in the car park were unmarked. It had been necessary for double yellow lines to be marked along the access road to the car park to ensure that this remained clear for larger vehicles. Similar safety problems had been experienced at Dale car park. The Community Council were of the view that the situation was different in a rural location to villages like Broad Haven or Little Haven. They considered the installation of the machines to be harmful to the area and its qualities by reason of their impact on amenity and safety – an attendant was necessary to manage the vehicles and signpost users to local services. Mrs Evans asked Members to visit the site in order to understand the issues better.



The Authority's Monitoring Officer considered that Members had no conflict of interest in determining the application, even though the site was owned by the National Park Authority. He also clarified that, similarly, membership of the National Trust by any individual Member of the Authority would not require a declaration of interest. Officers confirmed that in terms of the ownership certificates submitted with the application, the correct procedures appeared to have been followed.

Turning to the second point made by the Community Council, some Members agreed that the use of a car park attendant provided employment and proper control of parking. They felt that a site visit would be helpful and this was therefore proposed and seconded.

The Head of Development responded by saying that matters relating to the management of the car park were not a material consideration in this application and the Solicitor agreed, pointing out that if the application were refused the car park could become self managed, with no attendant.

Members asked if it were possible to impose conditions on any approval which would affect the management, such as marking out parking bays and the officer replied that she did not believe this would be reasonable and would not meet the tests set out in the relevant Circular.

The motion that a site visit take place was then put to the vote and this was lost. A vote was then taken on the proposal to approve the application which was carried.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the five year expiration date and to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.**

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/14/0161  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs L Jones  
PROPOSAL: Convert & raise roof of existing building to provide a restaurant & guest house within managers accommodation  
LOCATION: Royal British Legion, St Marys Street, Tenby

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn.

**NOTED.**

*[Councillor L Jenkins tendered her apologies and left the meeting during consideration of the following application]*





- (f) REFERENCE: NP/14/0184  
APPLICANT: Mr G Peters  
PROPOSAL: A 'Solar Hamlet' comprised of 2 detached & 4 semi-detached Ty Solar type houses  
LOCATION: Land adjacent to Glanrhyd House, Glanrhyd, Nevern

Members were reminded that at its previous meeting, the Committee had resolved to carry out a site inspection with regard to this application and this had taken place on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2014.

The application proposed the development of the site for six dwellings, four of which were offered as two bed affordable units and two as three bed market homes. They were specially designed prototype solar houses constructed in a modular form from locally sourced larch and insulated with recycled newsprint. It was reported that they would have very low levels of embodied energy in construction terms and would achieve a Code for Sustainable Homes rating of 5 and would also contribute to local employment through locally sourced materials and through the overall supply chain.

Officers considered that the principle of developing this brownfield site for a mixed market and affordable housing scheme was acceptable. While the limited accessibility of the site meant that normally only affordable housing would be acceptable, the offer of 67% affordable housing, which was in accordance with policy, meant that officers had successfully negotiated with the applicant that an intermediate rental on the affordable dwellings, (on which there was no government subsidy), would be an acceptable way forward to achieve this high percentage of affordable homes. In addition, a highly sustainable and energy efficient development as a pioneering project for Pembrokeshire was also welcomed. The detailed layout and design were not the accepted norm, however on balance the benefits of the scheme outweighed these issues and could be covered to some extent by conditions. Therefore the application was recommended for approval subject to a section 106 obligation and conditions.

At the meeting it was noted that a request had been received for a further financial contribution from PCC Library service, in addition to the Education service contribution already requested. The Highway department had also commented that should the internal road become adopted it would not necessarily require street lighting, however it was pointed out that at this time the internal road was being shown as being maintained as a private access road.

With regard to public comments, an additional letter had been received from the owners of Glanrhyd House (next door) withdrawing their



previous letter of support as they were now objecting and endorsing the letter of objection submitted by the owners of the Old School which requested refusal of this application on the grounds of being contrary to Park purposes, out of scale and character, of poor design and layout and running counter to the local vernacular of Glanrhyd.

At the site visit it had been pointed out that there was evidence that Japanese knotweed was present on the site. It was reported that the applicant was aware of this and the need to abide by the removal protocol as advised by Natural Resources Wales. Any planning permission would contain an advisory that this non-native invasive species was on site.

The applicant, Mr Peters, then addressed the Committee. He first outlined for Members the rationale for the project, which stemmed from a report two years ago which stated that 25% of UK households were in energy poverty and that in parts of West Wales this figure was significantly worse. He had therefore started a project to build a house that was so energy efficient that there would be no bills, and had very low construction costs. Building on research from Scandinavia and Germany, the raw material – wood – could be found all around, as this could be sourced from within the National Park. Also as they wanted to make the house produce its own energy, solar panels on the roofs were also proposed, together with an electric hook-up and electric car to provide transport as part of the project. The design of the house itself was important as it had to face south and have a monopitch roof to maximise the production of energy; windows would be triple glazed and the house well insulated. Having designed the Ty Solar house, a site was needed. He had experienced much opposition to the building of affordable homes, however the site in Glanrhyd appeared to be a good location, very close to the workshop providing the units and therefore reducing transport and time costs. He concluded by saying that this development would be a showcase for housing, not just for Wales, but for the whole of the UK.

The Monitoring Officer clarified for Members that even if the applicant was to source material from the National Park Authority's woodland centre, this had to be separated from the planning function, and Members should discount such matters as being material to their determination of the application. This matter had to be decided on planning merits alone and individual Members of the Authority did not need to declare any interest under the Code of Conduct.

Members considered this to be an exciting project and supported the application. They did, however, seek assurance on a number of matters including sewage, landscaping and access onto a road that carried a lot of quarry lorries. Officers responded to these, reassuring Members that the Authority's Tree Officer had looked at issue of boundary trees and



would work with the applicant to ensure they were dealt with safely but ensuring that privacy of the adjoining property was maintained and enhanced. Other landscaping on site would be dealt with by condition - this would include a strong hedgebank along the front of the site which would prevent direct access to the road frontage units other than via the estate road. With regard to the sewage treatment, as it was proposed that the properties would be rental this element would likely remain in the control of the landlord and it was in everyone's interests that the system operated properly. Problems with sewerage systems would usually be dealt with by normal call-out systems and in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

Although supporting the proposals, a number of Members did express some concern over the design of the dwellings, particularly the fenestration. The Director of Park Direction and Planning replied that the design was such to maximise daylight to the properties, with an overhang to provide shade from the heat of the summer sun. She reassured Members that the prototype dwelling did not look as imposing as the drawings would suggest. She also noted that the site was not intrusive within the landscape and would be further softened by the proposed landscaping. Sustainable drainage pavements would be used in place of tarmac on the internal access road and a storage unit had been incorporated to the rear or side of each property to reduce external domestic paraphernalia. Finally Members asked that the community of Glanrhyd be kept informed and engaged with construction of the site.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions to include time, plan references, external lighting, materials, boundary treatments, trees and landscaping, restriction on Permitted Development rights, sustainable code level 5 and land contamination also the provision of a legal agreement regarding affordable housing.**

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/14/0194  
APPLICANT:  
PROPOSAL: Alterations & provide 2 storey extension to existing storage building together with change of use of existing storage building to a microbrewery & associated works which include raising of 2 roof levels & provision of new rooflights  
LOCATION: To the rear of The Buccaneer Inn, St Julian's Street, Tenby

It was reported that this application proposed the change of use of a storage building to a microbrewery/visitor centre. The development



included the provision of new door opening on the west and south elevations. Plans showed that the building would provide a microbrewery on the ground floor which would be visible through new glazed viewing screens from the external cobbled yard area and Sergeants Lane, and from the first floor viewing and reception area which would incorporate glass floor panels and also have a new external door access from the existing Buccaneer Inn beer garden area. Also proposed was a new two storey storage room served by a new external door from the existing beer garden area. Other alterations included provision of new fenestration throughout to existing openings and new rooflights together with feature windows and a new oak barrel hoist to be located on the north elevation at first floor level.

Officers advised that the proposal for a microbrewery conflicted with Policy 50 of the Local Development Plan, however the report provided an assessment of the material planning considerations that were specific to this application and which were persuasive in allowing a departure from the Plan. Taking account of all material considerations and other policies contained within the Local Development Plan and National Policy, officers considered that the development proposed, subject to suitable conditions, was acceptable and would not have an adverse impact on the special qualities of this area of the National Park or on the character and amenity of the Tenby Conservation Area.

A number of letters of objection had been received, and the main areas of concern – the impact of the development upon residential amenity in the area by virtue of smell, noise, light, timing of the works and disturbance as well as concern with the traffic impact upon the area – were set out in the report. Taking account of these concerns, officers considered that the development could be suitably and adequately controlled through conditions and that refusal on grounds of a potential impact upon amenity would be unreasonable.

It was reported at the meeting that amended drawing had been received which reduced the height and proposed insertion of obscured glazing in the northern elevation.

Members were pleased to see re-use of buildings that they considered to be a stunning survival of 'old Tenby' and considered this to be an exciting project which could be a stimulus for further development in the area. They did, however, express some concern at the large area of glazing in the north-eastern elevation, considering this to be too modern for the locality, and asked that this be amended with discussions to involve the Authority's Building Conservation Officer.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Head of**



**Development Management to grant approval subject to conditions and to an amendment of the glazed area in the north east elevation.**

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/14/0236  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs T Thomas  
PROPOSAL: Residential development of 8 properties including 4 affordable apartments  
LOCATION: Land at Blockett Farm, Blockett Lane, Little Haven

Outline planning permission was sought for eight dwellings on this site at Blockett Farm, Little Haven, four as market houses and four as affordable units in the form of a single block of flats. All matters had been reserved, but the application was accompanied by an illustrative layout which was similar to that previously refused, but with Plot 2 containing the four flats. Access was shown to be taken from Blockett Lane, utilising the existing access which partly serves the two detached houses already constructed and also provided an access onto the application site.

Members were reminded that the site has a long and complex planning history, and this was set out in the report which also assessed the proposal against all material considerations and the relevant national and local development plan policies. While the principal of development of the site was acceptable, Officers considered that the proposal would represent over development of the site, resulting in a cramped appearance that would be harmful to the special qualities of the National Park. Furthermore the proposals would result in an increased amount of traffic that would cause an unacceptable level of congestion and road safety danger and the illustrative access arrangements were not considered to be acceptable on highway safety grounds.

The Agent, Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries, then addressed the Committee saying that he came before them with a heavy heart as he was of the opinion that members had no option but to refuse the application. His applicant had tried to submit an application in line with policy by addressing the reasons for the previous refusal. Focusing on the highway issue, Mr Vaughan-Harries explained that the Highway Authority had been happy with the new access proposed in the previous application, however it had been refused in part due to the Authority's concerns with that access. They therefore found themselves backed into a corner as to how to access the site. Noting that the application was in outline, and the plan purely illustrative, Mr Vaughan-Harries expressed a willingness to look at other options, but he was concerned that these would not be acceptable to the Highway Authority. If the application was refused he hoped that a meeting could be held between officers of the Authority, the Head of Highways at Pembrokeshire County Council and the applicant in



order to find a solution to the problem.

Whilst agreeing that they could do nothing but refuse the current application, Members were concerned that a solution had not yet been found for redevelopment of this site, which would be in everyone's interest. Another Member suggested that perhaps the issue with density on the site was due to the level of affordable housing required by the Authority's policy and asked that this percentage be reconsidered as part of the discussions going forward. The Head of Development Management expressed full support for further discussions to be held regarding this site, but added that many meetings had been held in the past and that she did not believe that the Highway Authority were against the principle of re-using the current access, just found the proposed configuration and layout to be unacceptable. She also noted that whilst officers could have meetings with the applicant and his agent, that she had no control over what the applicant actually chose to submit as a planning application. At this point the applicant, Mr T Thomas in the audience, stood up, gesticulated and shouted at Ms Hirst words to the effect that she knew this was a pack of lies. The Chair asked the applicant to leave the meeting and said it was unacceptable for him to subject officers or Members to this type of behaviour. As he left the meeting he aggressively pointed at the Director of Park Direction and Planning and said 'and you Gibson'. With regard to the level of affordable housing the Head of Development Management stated that the Authority had not received a viability assessment for the site, despite requests, but were happy to look at this should one be submitted.

**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 proposal for eight dwellings as illustrated on the submitted drawings, would result in over development of the site, resulting in a cramped and urban appearance and providing limited opportunities for landscaping and environmental enhancement. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be harmful to the visual appearance of the area and the special qualities of the National Park and would be contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.**
- 2. Policy 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seeks to only allow development where access is**



appropriate. Inappropriate access is considered to include where traffic is likely to have an unacceptable impact on road safety. The proposed development would result in an increase in traffic that will lead to an unacceptable level of congestion and road safety danger on Blockett Lane and Blockett Hill.

3. **Policy 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seeks to only allow development where access is appropriate. The illustrative plans submitted with the application do not provide sufficient information to guarantee that the visibility sight line looking south from the proposed access can be provided, that adequate provision for the turning of vehicles clear of the public highway can be provided, and that the layout of the access will enable satisfactory movement between the site and the highway for the users of the access for the proposed development and the existing development on the adjacent shared driveway. As such it is not considered that appropriate access can be achieved.**

#### 9. Appeals

The Head of Development Management reported on 7 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.

**NOTED.**

#### 10. Delegated applications/notifications

42 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 42, it was reported that 2 applications had been refused, 1 part refused, part granted, 1 cancelled and 1 withdrawn.

**NOTED.**

#### 11. Chairman's Announcement

The Chairman announced that sadly this would be the last meeting attended by the Authority's Head of Development Management, Vicki Hirst, who would be leaving the Authority at the end of August. She wished Ms Hirst well in her new position saying that she would be missed immensely and that it had been a pleasure to work with her. Councillor M Williams, as a former Chairman of the Committee, added that the Authority owed Ms Hirst a great deal of thanks for her work in improving the performance of the Development Management department which had been poor when she started in the job. Ms Hirst thanked Members for



their support over the years and hoped that they would continue to look after the National Park.

**NOTED.**

