

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

21st January 2015

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)

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

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 2.15pm]

1. Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman informed the Committee of the recent sad death of Mr Robin Evans. Mr Evans had served, as a County Councillor, on the National Park Authority for many years. Everyone present stood in a minute's silence to remember him.

2. Apologies

Mrs M Thomas had rung to say that she was delayed in traffic on the motorway and would arrive late.

3. Disclosures of interest

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

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minutes 7(j) below</i> NP/14/0617 Blackwells Cottage, Landshipping, Narberth	Councillor R Lewis	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

A number of Members also referred to the fact that they had received correspondence and telephone calls regarding a number of the applications on the agenda that day, and sought the advice of the Monitoring Officer with regard to the need to declare an interest. The Monitoring Officer replied that as long as Members came into the meeting with open minds regarding those applications, there were no issues to declare.

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 3rd December 2014 and 7th January 2015 were presented for confirmation and signature.



It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on the 3rd December 2014 and 7th January 2015 be confirmed and signed.

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/14/0518 <i>Minute 7(e) refers</i>	Change of use of Thomas Memorial Chapel to single dwelling, change of use of part of the ground floor of the Manse from Class A2 to residential. Erection of a dwelling to the rear of the Chapel and partial demolition of The Manse and Chapel to provide off-street parking and associated works – The Manse & Thomas memorial Chapel, High Street, Saundersfoot	Cllr P Baker, County Councillor
NP/14/0532 <i>Minute 7(f) refers</i>	New build 4 bedroom 1.5 storey dwelling – Plot between Cartref & Fernlea, Nolton Haven	Mr P O'Connor, Objector Mr J Owen, Applicant
NP/14/0637 <i>Minute 7(k) refers</i>	Diversification of Brumwells Garden Machinery with the provision of 12 sustainable wigwam lodges with car parking on adjacent land. Link the existing dwelling of Badgers Hold as a live-work dwelling for the two businesses – Brumwell Garden Machinery, Badgers Holt, Jameston	Cllr P Kidney, County Councillor Mr A Staniland, Applicant



NP/14/0664 <i>Minute 7(l)</i> <i>Refers</i>	Amendment to design of the replacement dwelling consented under NP/13/0442 due to removal of basement, 2 single storey lean-to extensions to house, storage and a plant room. New outbuilding – Carneithan, St Davids	Mr W McMorran, Applicant
---	---	-----------------------------

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.

The Solicitor pointed out to the Committee that a number of decisions had been deferred at recent meetings and that in such cases the applicants may be able to appeal because of non-determination and there could be implications for the Authority if that course of action were followed.

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/14/0311
APPLICANT: Mr D Harries
PROPOSAL: Proposed cattle accommodation building, associated yard area & slurry lagoon
LOCATION: Velindre, St Nicholas, Goodwick

Members were reminded that this application had been deferred at the October meeting of the Committee to allow the applicant to submit amended landscaping proposals.

The proposed development would allow the farm to expand its milking operation from 540 up to 860 milking cows and although this would offer some economic benefit, officers considered that the intensive nature of the development represented an inappropriate and harmful industrial form of development on land within the open countryside within the National Park. The proposed development by reason of its very form, character and scale would erode the special qualities of the National Park and would not be compatible with the strategic aims of conserving or enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park, and the public understanding and enjoyment of those qualities.

Officers had considered the revised landscaping proposals and had commissioned an independent landscape consultant report to look at the scheme provided. As a result of the conclusions of that report, which was appended for Members, and in considering information provided as part of the complete application, it remained the view of officers that the development would have an adverse effect upon the special qualities of the National Park such that the recommendation of refusal remained.

The cattle accommodation building and slurry lagoon would expand the site area visible and result in an unacceptable loss of a sense of remoteness and tranquillity, would not protect the pattern and diversity of the landscape, would be insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape, would introduce and intensify a use which was incompatible with its location and would fail to harmonise with or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park. In addition to these concerns, the slurry lagoon by virtue of its form, scale and siting would have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and visitors to the area due to the development consisting of a use inappropriate for where people live and visit, being of a scale incompatible with its surroundings and being visually intrusive.

The report stated that if planning permission were to be granted for the scheme in the face of this conflict, the harm would need to be clearly outweighed by other material considerations. There were advantages to the proposal that weighed in favour of the grant of planning permission



and these advantages included the fact that the proposed development would create additional employment, both permanently on the farm, and during the temporary construction phase, together with increased profitability for the farm. However, there was no evidence to support the assertion that this development was necessary for the continued operation of the farm and the economic benefits must be weighed against the potential detriments, such as the impact on nearby holiday lets and tourism generally. Officers considered that the economic benefits of the scheme should not be overstated and were far outweighed by the harm to the special qualities of the National Park in this instance.

It was reported at the meeting that since the report had been written, the applicant had commenced work on the cattle building due to the delay in deciding the application and concerns over animal welfare. This work, which was in accordance with the submitted plans, was unauthorised and the application for consideration was now partly retrospective and the description would be amended accordingly. However Members were reminded that the application should be treated on its merits with no regard taken of its retrospective nature.

A number of additional letters had been received since the previous meeting of the Committee, including one from the Friends of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, and the issues raised were reported to Members. A new landscape report had also been received from the applicant in November. In response to this, the Authority had commissioned an independent report which had concluded that in time the proposed landscaping would screen the lagoon, but the application still failed to meet other criteria of the policy concerning conservation of the National Park.

Members thanked officers for the comprehensive nature of the report and also for arranging the workshop on the challenges facing agriculture which had taken place in December and which had helped Members to better understand the issues. They also noted that the site inspection had been very useful. While wishing to support agriculture, a number of Members nevertheless expressed concern about the effect, particularly of the slurry lagoon, on the amenity of neighbours and also about the impact of the massing of the proposed buildings on the landscape. While there were material considerations these seemed to centre on the improved profitability of the farm, to the detriment of neighbouring properties. Although it was acknowledged that this landscape had been formed largely through the impact of farming, they agreed that this application, being of industrial scale, did not support Park Purposes, and the recommendation of refusal was moved and seconded. One Member felt that it might be possible to screen the development to minimise its impact,



however others felt that such screening would make matters worse by remodelling the landscape.

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

- 1. The proposed development represents an inappropriate and harmful industrial form of development on land within the open countryside within the National Park. The proposed expansion through a new cattle accommodation building and slurry lagoon by virtue of their siting, form, character and scale will erode the special qualities of the National Park and will not be compatible with the strategic aims of conserving or enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park, and the public understanding and enjoyment of those qualities. The development will result in a loss of a sense of remoteness and tranquillity, will not protect the pattern and diversity of the landscape, will be insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape, will introduce and intensify a use which is incompatible with its location and will fail to harmonise with or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park. The development is not considered to be well designed in terms of place and local distinctiveness, is of a scale that is incompatible with its surroundings and is visually intrusive. As such the development is contrary to the requirements of Policy 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), Policy 8 (Special Qualities) (criteria a and c), Policy 15 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) (criteria b, c and d), Policy 29 (Sustainable Design) (criterion a) and Policy 30 (Amenity) (criteria a, b and d) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (Adopted September 2010) and Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7, July 2014).**

- 2. The slurry lagoon by virtue of its siting, form, character and scale will have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and visitors to the area due to the development consisting of a use inappropriate for where people live and visit, contrary to the requirements of Policy 30 (Amenity) (Criteria a, b and d) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan.**

[Mrs M Thomas arrived at this juncture]



- (b) REFERENCE: NP/14/0402
APPLICANT: Mr G Birt, Five Arches Car Park Ltd
PROPOSAL: Renewal of temporary permission for use of land as car park with associated pay machines, signage and planters
LOCATION: Land formerly Tenby Ford Garage, Five Arches Car Park, South Parade, Tenby

Members were reminded that this application had been considered by the Committee at its meeting in December when the application was subject to a cooling off period, as Members were minded to approve the application subject to conditions and that decision would be contrary to policy.

It was reported that use of the land as a car park had been granted temporary consent previously and the site cleared of all but one structure which now remained and provided an attendants' office and covered parking area. The current application proposed the renewal of temporary permission for a further 3 years for use of the land as a car park with associated pay machines, signage, additional lighting and landscape planters and these elements were retrospective.

Since the last meeting of the Committee a further consultation had been undertaken with the Highway Authority and an amended response received which stated that the Highway Authority remained unable to support the application as the applicant had yet to demonstrate that there was a demand for this car park or that the potential of re-development had been explored. A copy of the newly adopted Regional Transport Plan had also been provided to the Authority and this referred to Tenby's sustainable access project and development in the Park and Ride service. There was no specific reference to parking provision in the plan as this was not considered the solution for improving access to Tenby; however the general approach to additional parking was identified in the amended response from the Highway Authority. The response also stated that should the Committee decide to support this application two conditions be included requiring details of parking facilities including disabled and short stay allocation, favouring a 75% short stay allocation to the front and a 25% long stay allocation to the rear, together with a condition requiring details of cycle parking facilities.

The agent had also provided revised drawings to take account of several elements referred to in the previously suggested reasons for refusal. These indicated 6 disabled spaces, 87 other parking spaces together with 6 motorcycle spaces and 12 bicycle spaces with the latter two areas being protected by bollards. While the total number of parking spaces had increased from 91 to 93, the amended level of facilities was now



considered to be acceptable for this car park should Members be minded to approve.

Further correspondence from the agent also stated that the southern boundary wall would be repaired and painted although no details of this had been provided on the amended drawings. In addition, the agent had indicated further landscape planting, if required by the Committee, could be provided by way of condition, however the applicant would not be satisfied with a condition that would determine use arrangements in respect of short or long stay parking.

While the views of the Town Council were noted, at no time had a need for an additional car park been demonstrated with evidence of a shortage of car parking in Tenby. Furthermore the applicant had failed to take account of the required short stay provision within the proposed car park. The proposed scheme for the renewal of the previous temporary permission for a further three years was considered by officers to be contrary to national and local planning policy and also the Regional Transport Plan and could not be supported.

Before considering the application, one Member sought advice as to whether any of the Pembrokeshire County Council (PCC) Members needed to declare an interest, given that the remainder of the car parks in Tenby were owned by PCC. The Monitoring Officer advised that the Members were not that day representing PCC and unless their minds were closed, there was no need for them to disclose an interest.

Despite the views of the Highway Authority and the recommendation of refusal from officers, most Members were still minded to approve the application. The reasons given for this were to prevent the site becoming derelict in the short term, whilst economic conditions improve to enable redevelopment, to support and promote the retail area of the town and thereby support the social and economic well being of the National Park and to improve easy access to the town for disabled persons. Although officers cautioned that continued consent for temporary permission had in case law been considered equivalent to granting permanent consent, Members felt that when market conditions improved, the car park use would be superseded by employment or other uses.

One Member spoke in favour of the recommendation of refusal giving weight to the views of the Highway Authority and wanting to safeguard the future development of the site for uses other than car parking.

There then followed some discussion on potential conditions, if the application were approved, and the officer read out those that had been imposed on the previous temporary consent. Some discussion on whether



to include all of those conditions ensued, and a consensus on conditions to be imposed was reached.

As the application had been subject to the 'cooling off' procedure, a recorded vote was then taken, and the motion for approval of the application was carried.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to temporary consent being granted for 3 years; development in accordance with current plans; details of landscaping and maintenance to be provided within 2 months; no overnight sleeping; no additional or directional signage; the ground to remain unbroken due to issues of contamination, other than for investigation or remediation purposes; and details of repair and painting of the southern boundary wall to be provided within 2 months, details of planting and maintenance thereof to be provided within 2 months.

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/14/0443
APPLICANT: Mr D Thompstone
PROPOSAL: New two storey detached dwelling with access onto existing driveway and associated hard and soft landscaping
LOCATION: Larchlands, Swallow Tree, Saundersfoot

This application had been considered by the Development Management Committee at its meeting in December when it was deferred to allow the Committee to undertake a site visit. This took place on 7th January 2015 and the minutes of this meeting were reported to the meeting (Minute 3 refers). Planning approval was sought for a new two storey detached dwelling to be located within the garden area of Larchlands, with a new access onto the existing driveway and associated hard and soft landscaping.

The Community Council had objected to the proposals, and while its views were noted, officers considered that the scheme had a scale, mass, form and detailed design which was acceptable. The proposal would provide adequate parking for the existing and new dwelling, and the design would ensure the amenity and privacy of neighbours was maintained and protected along with the special qualities of the National Park when viewed from the immediate and wider landscape. As such the proposal was supported by officers and the recommendation was one of delegation subject to a satisfactory unilateral agreement being provided.

Before consideration of the application, one Member explained that he had been unable to attend the site visit and sought clarification as to



whether he was able to vote. The Monitoring Officer replied that the decision as to whether to vote was for each individual Member, and should depend on whether they felt they were in full possession of the facts of the matter before them.

It was reported that since the last meeting a response had been received from Welsh Water which supported the current proposal subject to condition (s) relating to foul and surface water discharges from the site. A further landscaping drawing had also been submitted which clearly detailed the landscaping proposals for the site. The officer updated Members with regard to questions raised at the site visit. Referring to the landscaping plans provided with the report, these indicated the degree to which landscaping would be lost on the boundary with Bower House, also that the finished floor levels would be approximately 2.75m higher. The distance between the properties would be 17.6m, and the density of the property would be 20.7%, when compared to 21.85% and 19% at the adjacent two properties.

Members found the site visit useful to see the proposed location of the property and its setting and density in the surrounding area. They were also grateful to the neighbour for allowing them to see the site of the proposed dwelling from his property. A number of Members considered that the amenity of that neighbour would be compromised by the proposed development, and that his ability to provide screening through additional landscaping would be limited due to the north facing aspect. They also felt that the proposals would be overdevelopment and would be to the detriment of both Larchlands and neighbouring Bower House. Some were also concerned about the precedent that would be set.

Other Members noted that the application did comply with the Parker Morris Standards in terms of separation distances and overshadowing. The view from the neighbouring property would also be of the blank gable end of the proposed dwelling and so there would be no overlooking. The recommendation of approval was therefore moved and seconded.

A vote was then taken on the motion of approval but this was not carried. A motion of refusal was then put, with the reasons given being loss of amenity, loss of privacy, overcrowding and a change in the character of the area and this was carried. It was clarified that this decision would not be subject to the 'cooling off' procedures where members take planning decisions counter to officer recommendations as it was not identified as being a significant departure from policy.

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

- 1. The proposed development by virtue of its scale, siting, form and design would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the existing area and result in the loss of amenity and privacy to**



neighbouring properties known as Larchlands and Bower House. Given the scale of the dwelling it is also considered that the proposal will result in overdevelopment of the site. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to (criteria b & c) of Policy 8 – Special Qualities, (criteria a, b & d) of Policy 15 – Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, (criterion a) of Policy 29 – sustainable Design and (criteria b & d) of Policy 30 – Amenity.

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/14/0479
APPLICANT: The Hean Castle Estate
PROPOSAL: Development comprising 31 residential units with an amended access and with all other matters reserved (outline)
LOCATION: Land off Trewayne Lane, New Hedges, Tenby

It was reported that the application was before the Committee as it was considered a Major Development. It proposed, in outline, the erection of 31 residential units to include an amended access and with all other matters reserved. The scheme put forward that 6 of the total 31 units were to be for affordable housing. Plans showed the construction of a new access to the site which would require reorientation of the existing Cross Park entrance and relocation of the bus shelter.

Following consideration of the policies within the Local Development Plan, it could be concluded that the principle of development of this site for housing purposes, given that it was a housing allocation, was acceptable. Subject to detailed scrutiny of the layout, appearance, scale and landscaping at reserved matters stage, and subject to the developer entering into a Section 106 agreement to commit to the provision of affordable housing on site and other planning obligations, the application was acceptable and recommended for approval.

Some Members were concerned by the issues of flooding and of privacy raised by residents and the Community Council. The Head of Development Management replied that both Natural Resources Wales and Welsh Water had been consulted on the application, and both had recommended consent subject to conditions. He read out the condition recommended by Welsh Water and Members were satisfied that this should ensure the protection of dwellings in Hunters Park. With regard to the privacy of dwellings at Cross Park, officers advised that a landscaping scheme would be required as one of the conditions, and high quality layout and design would be expected.

One Member questioned whether it was likely the level of affordable housing provided as part of the development would increase, if market conditions improved. The officer replied that in accordance with the



revised Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing, the level was lower than that expected when the Local Development Plan was prepared, however it was at a level that was suitable having regard to the viability assessment undertaken. Another member queried whether the landscaping proposals were fixed and the officer replied that these were in outline only and further details would be required by way of condition.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive (National Park Officer) /Director of Park Direction and Planning/ Head of Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the interested person(s) first entering into a satisfactory Section 106 Legal Agreement (s) with regard to provision of 20% affordable housing units, a contribution for the provision or enhancement of educational facilities, highway works and improvements, upgrading and adding equipment to the area and to upgrade/add exiting community facilities. The permission would also be subject to conditions requiring details of reserved matters to be provided and agreed before development began, such an application to be received within 3 years from the date of permission, development to begin before the expiration of 5 years or before expiration of 2 years for the date of the approval of the last of the reserved matters, detailed site survey plan, regard to Manual for Streets and Secured by Design, detailed plans of levels, gradients and construction for access roads, new access and bus stop lay by and shelter to be completed before other works commence; access roads to be constructed, suitable areas for parking and turning within the site, surface water drainage, scheme for disposal of foul and surface water (SUDS), tree protection scheme, landscaping scheme, construction method statement, external lighting scheme, ecological enhancement scheme, details of buffer between residential development and eastern hedgerow and details of pollution prevention.

[The Committee adjourned for 10 minutes]



- (e) REFERENCE: NP/14/0518
APPLICANT: Mr DJ Beynon
PROPOSAL: Change of use of Thomas Memorial Chapel to a single dwelling, change of use of part of the ground floor of the Manse from Class A2 to residential. Erection of a dwelling to the rear of the Chapel and partial demolition of The Manse and Chapel to provide off-street parking & associated works
LOCATION: The Manse & Thomas Memorial Chapel, High Street, Saundersfoot

This application was reported to the Development Management Committee as a departure from the Local Development Plan with a recommendation of conditional approval.

The application sought approval for the creation of two new dwellings in addition to the extension of an existing dwelling currently located at first floor within the Manse. The proposed change of use of the chapel would allow creation of a four bedroom dwelling set across three floors. Partial demolition of the rear wing of the chapel would be required to facilitate the creation of a complete new build dwelling within the rear of the site, accessed via a stairway from the off street parking area. Finally with regard to the Manse, at ground floor level the proposal would require the demolition of the rear extension and left hand window bay to provide a vehicle access through to the off street parking space, which would be covered to facilitate a new amenity area at first floor level. The existing use of the ground floor unit being A2 would require change of use to C3 to form the new dining room with kitchen to the rear to serve the residential accommodation on the first and second floors. The proposal also included a new wall and railings to form a new front boundary.

The proposal was considered to be in accordance with the Local Development Plan when read as a whole. While the proposed scheme did not meet the criteria of Policy 50 (Town and District Shopping Centres) officers considered that based on the information provided, and in the interests of protecting the vitality and viability of Saundersfoot, there were material considerations in this instance which on balance were considered to outweigh the policy objection. This view was taken as the loss of retail on this site was not considered to be a significant loss to the overall provision of retail within the retail centre and the proposal also provided an opportunity for residential accommodation in a sustainable location.

Turning to a consideration of affordable housing, the agent had submitted an economic viability assessment for the proposal which considered both on-site affordable provision and also off site contributions. The



information provided had been appropriately assessed through the three dragons toolkit and the assessment proved that the development would not be viable if a requirement for either on-site provision or off-site contribution were imposed and therefore the proposed scheme would not be required to either provide affordable housing or contribute towards affordable housing in the local area.

The proposal was considered to preserve the setting of the adjacent Rose Cottage, a listed building and also retained the character of the group of buildings within the streetscape that formed part of the Conservation 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 was an acceptable departure from Policy 50 of the Local Development Plan and could be supported subject to appropriate conditions.

Councillor Phil Baker, a speaker, then addressed the Committee. He supported this application which would bring the Chapel back to life. He felt it was an innovative and interesting design which respected the character of the building and retained detail. The scheme would also bring forward varied accommodation. Concerns had been expressed locally about disruption during the construction phase, however Councillor Baker was happy that as the developer was local, he would be aware of the issues and would deal with them appropriately. Concern had also been expressed about the loss of on street parking, however he pointed out that until recently there had been no parking in the area at all, and he was in discussions with the Highway Authority to try to arrange for parking of a similar nature to continue in the vicinity. He did not believe that the loss of retail was significant as two additional retail units would be provided at the Cambrian development, and he was happy that the concerns raised by near neighbours and the Community Council could be dealt with by conditions. Councillor Baker believed Saundersfoot was undergoing a renaissance and this was a very exciting project.

Members were pleased that the change of use of the site nevertheless maintained the character of the buildings. One Member asked whether the render of the house would be in hard cement or lime mortar and the Building Conservation Officer replied that as this was not a listed building, the finish would be plain smooth render, painted and the material could not be controlled. It was suggested that an advisory note suggesting the use of lime mortar could be added to the decision notice. The planning officer also reassured the Committee that the Highway Authority was happy with the traffic management arrangements for the development and that the developer would be aware of the need to maintain access in what was part of the village's one way system.



DECISION: That the application approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of works, accordance with approved drawings, a photographic record being made of the existing buildings, provision of detailed drawings of fenestration and railings, external materials and colours and the creation of the new vehicle access and alterations to the parking bay area on High Street; access gates to be set back from the carriageway, parking and turning, external lighting scheme, land drainage runoff, surface water discharge, landscaping and boundary treatments including protection measures, construction method statement, removal of permitted development rights.

[Councillor P Morgan tendered his apologies and left the meeting]

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/14/0532
APPLICANT: Mr J Owen
PROPOSAL: New build 4 bedroom 1.5 storey dwelling
LOCATION: Plot between Cartref & Fernlea, Nolton Haven, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this site currently formed a gap in a line of bungalows that ran along the northern side of the highway in the village of Nolton Haven. This was a full application for a one and a half storey detached four bedroom dwelling, which included a rear one and a half storey wing.

Officers had carefully considered the proposal against all material considerations and the relevant national and local development plan policies. The proposed scheme was considered to have a scale, mass, form and detailed design which was considered to be acceptable. The proposal would provide adequate parking for the new dwelling, and the design would ensure the amenity and privacy of neighbours was maintained and protected, along with the special qualities of the National Park when viewed from the immediate and wider landscape. It was noted that the applicant had addressed three of the four reasons for refusal on the previous outline application under NP/13/0134, however the current proposal remained contrary to policy 7 of the Local Development Plan due to the limited public transport to provide accessibility to this open market dwelling.

Therefore on balance while the proposed dwelling was considered to have an acceptable design, contributed towards affordable housing and did not have an adverse impact on neighbours, the dwelling was not considered to be accessible and therefore was recommended for refusal for that reason only.



It was reported at the meeting that the applicant had submitted a personal transport plan to support his application and this had been circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting. Responses had also been received from Welsh Water supporting the application, and Nolton and Roch Community Council which offered no objection. A letter of support had been received from Paul Davies AM and a letter of objection from a neighbour expressing concern about the height of the proposed dwelling.

The first of two speakers was Mr Paul O'Connor who owned the adjacent property, Cartref. Having read the officers report, he said that he accepted much of the judgement of the planning officer, however he asked that if a dwelling of this height and scale were to proceed, that it be sited further away from Cartref. He stated that the gap between the two, as currently proposed, was about 5m.

The second speaker was Mr James Owen, the applicant. He explained that he lived and worked in Nolton, residing with his parents, and wished to live in a house of his own. The plot was only ¼ mile from his workplace, and because of this he intended to walk to work. Transport during the working day would be in a work vehicle, however he had his own vehicle. He pointed out that the Puffin Shuttle operated a sufficient number of journeys for a large part of the year, with a reduced timetabled during the winter. He pointed out that three houses had been built in the village during the last year, and they were not on a bus route. He explained that he was happy to pay the lump sum towards affordable housing as required by the policy and felt that there was justification for overriding the accessibility policy in this instance. He concluded by saying that the Community Council supported the application, and letters of support had also been received from the local MP, AM and Leader of the County Council.

Members were disappointed that the application was recommended for refusal with the accessibility policy forming the only reason. They had expressed their concerns regarding this policy in the past and while they understood that it had to be taken into consideration, they understood that it would be considered in the round as one of other material considerations, but would not be an over-riding policy objection. They noted that the applicant had submitted a satisfactory personal transport plan and was employed in the locality. While acknowledging that officers were working within a National Policy framework, they remained concerned that the policy allowed for a holiday let or affordable housing to be built, but not an open market dwelling, and also took little account of alternative means of sustainable transport. The point was also made that there was increasing pressure on the provision of public transport, and a service that existed today might not continue to operate. It was however pointed out by officers that planning permission was given to a property,



rather than a person. Another Member noted that the plans showed no Ordnance Datum point and asked that if planning permission were granted that the height of the building as shown on the plans could be tied to such a point. Officer replied that any permission could be conditioned so that levels were agreed on site.

Given the discussion, the Director of Park Direction and Planning informed the Committee that as the Accessibility Policy was a strategic policy, any approval contrary to that policy would be a significant departure, would be subject to the Authority's 'cooling off' period and would come back to the next meeting of the Committee for re-consideration. However it was moved and seconded that the application be approved, with the reason that the applicant had a personal transport plan, which was a material consideration.

DECISION: That Members were minded to approve the application as the site was an infill plot, satisfactory in all other respect, and the applicant had submitted a personal transport plan. However as the decision was contrary to the officer recommendation and was a significant departure to the adopted Local Development Plan, it was subject to the Authority's 'cooling off' procedures and would be re-considered at the next possible meeting of the Committee.

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/14/0592
APPLICANT: Mr A Middleton, TYF Group Ltd
PROPOSAL: Installation of an external flue to accommodate a new biomass boiler
LOCATION: 1, High Street, St Davids, Haverfordwest

This application was reported to the Committee because the views of the City Council were contrary to the recommendation of officers. A listed building application for this scheme would be considered under application NP/14/0593 (Minute 7(h) refers).

It was reported that 1 High Street was Grade II listed and located within the Conservation Area. The property had a prominent symmetrical rubble-stone façade, and a rear yard entered off New Street. Planning permission was sought for the installation of an external flue to accommodate a new biomass boiler.

Officers pointed out the duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting and features but considered the proposed scheme to be in keeping with the character of the listed building, and its setting in terms of design and form, and did not affect the character or appearance of the conservation area. As such the



development complied with the aims and requirements of policies of the Local Development Plan and the application was recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of the works and its accordance with approved drawings.

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/14/0593
APPLICANT: Mr A Middleton, TYF Group Ltd
PROPOSAL: Installation of external flue to accommodate new biomass boiler
LOCATION: 1, High Street, St Davids, Haverfordwest

This application fell within the provisions of the listed building delegation Direction awarded to the Authority by the Welsh Government on 25th July 2012, however it was reported to the Committee because the views of the City Council were contrary to the recommendation of officers. A planning application for this scheme had been considered under application NP/14/0592 (Minute 7(g) refers).

It was reported that 1 High Street was Grade II listed. The property had a prominent symmetrical rubble-stone façade, and a rear yard entered off New Street. Listed building consent was sought for the installation of an external flue to accommodate a new biomass boiler.

Officers pointed out the duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting and features but considered the proposed scheme to be in keeping with the character of the listed building, and its setting in terms of design and form. As such the development complied with the aims and requirements of policies of the Local Development Plan and the application could be supported, subject to conditions.

DECISION: That listed building consent be granted subject to conditions relating to the timing of the works and its accordance with approved drawings.

- (i) REFERENCE: NP/14/0599
APPLICANT: Mrs H Phippen
PROPOSAL: 3 detached houses with ancillary garages and gardens (Outline with all matters reserved)
LOCATION: Former Garden Centre, The Rhos, Haverfordwest

This application was reported to the Committee as a Departure from the Local Development Plan (LDP) with a recommendation of conditional



approval. The application proposed, in outline, the erection of 3 residential dwellings, indicative details identified that the dwellings would be of two storeys and positioned across the east part of the site each with a front garden, rear garden with garage and parking and turning facilities. A larger open area had been retained free of buildings along the west section of the site.

The application site had a history of planning applications proposing residential development, including comments from an inspector on appeal that were material considerations and this was set out in the report. While the proposed scheme did not fit with the terms of Policy 7 of the LDP in that it did not comprise an infill or rounding off opportunity, the history of the site and its use as a garden centre previously were material to consideration of the application. The grant of planning permission in 2009, as well as the Inspector's comments on potential development of the site at an earlier appeal, could be given considerable weight in this instance. Therefore following consideration of the policies contained within the LDP and National Planning Policy and having regard to all material considerations, officers considered that on balance the development for three dwellings was acceptable.

The benefits of the proposals were considered to outweigh any potential harm from the development and the scheme would provide positive contributions to affordable housing and obligations within the area. As such the principle of development for three dwellings was acceptable as a departure from policy 7 of the LDP.

Having considered applications on this site over a number of years, Members were pleased that the current application was in keeping with the Inspector's findings and was supported by the Community Council. One Member expressed the view that Rhos was an unspoilt estate village and hoped that future reserved matters application(s) would fit in with the landscape and add to the character of the village with the right detail.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive (National Park Officer)/Director of Park Direction and Planning/Head of Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the interested person(s) first entering into a Section 106 Agreement to include the following necessary planning obligations: Provision contributions towards affordable housing, enhancement of education facilities, highway works and improvements and upgrading/additions to existing community facilities. The permission would be subject to conditions relating to details of reserved matters being provided and agreed before development began, the timing of the works, detailed site survey plan and existing and proposed levels to be provided, tree protection scheme,



landscaping scheme, reptile survey or method statement dealing with site clearance and reptile relocation, construction method statement, external lighting scheme, ecological enhancement scheme, details of pollution prevention relating to the SAC and Scheme for disposal of foul and surface water. If the S106 legal agreement was not completed within 3 months, delegated power be given to officers to exercise discretion to refuse the application on the grounds of non-compliance with policies 45 and 48 of the Local Development Plan.

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

- (j) REFERENCE: NP/14/0617
APPLICANT: Mrs H Morris
PROPOSAL: Proposed detached garage/store to be used in conjunction with Blackwells Cottage
LOCATION: Blackwells Cottage, Landshipping, Narberth

It was reported that this application was reported to the Committee as the applicant was related to a Member of the Authority.

Full planning permission was sought for a single garage and store to be sited within the garden curtilage of Blackwells Cottage. The dwelling was located in a rural location to the south of Landshipping and accessed by a long private track. The site fell outside of any Centre boundary, and was considered to be in the countryside for policy purposes.

The proposed garage was of a simple, plain design and was to be used for purposes ancillary to the main dwelling house. The development would not be considered to be out of keeping to the local setting, would not be contrary to policies of the Local Development Plan, or would not have an adverse impact upon the special qualities of the National Park. Officers would, therefore, recommend approval of the application.

It was reported at the meeting that no third party responses had been received and that Martletwy Community Council had ratified their comments and had no objection.

Members were happy to move recommendation of approval, but noted that it was a large building and should be subject to a condition to ensure the garage was used only for that purpose, and officers confirmed that a condition which would not allow a separate or commercial use was proposed.



DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans and no separate or commercial use.

- (k) REFERENCE: NP/14/0637
APPLICANT: Mr W Staniland
PROPOSAL: Diversification of Brumwells Garden Machinery with the provision of 12 sustainable wigwam lodges with car parking on adjacent land. Link the existing dwelling of Badgers Holt as a live-work dwelling for the two businesses
LOCATION: Brumwell Garden Machinery, Badgers Holt, Jameston, Tenby

This application was reported to the Committee at the request of a Member and also as the views of Manorbier Community Council were contrary to that of officers. It sought permission for the change of use of the garden area of Badgers Holt to a “glamping” holiday site comprising twelve wigwams and associated road access, car parking spaces, cycle store and foul water discharge, and the linking of the existing dwelling as a live/ work unit to the “glamping” site and existing garden machinery business.

Officers considered that the principle of this proposal did not comply with adopted policies in relation to the provision of new camping, caravanning and static sites within the open countryside. Furthermore, the proposal would represent an unacceptable intrusion into the countryside, which would be out of character with and detrimental to the special qualities of the National Park. While the applicant’s agent had stated that he considered that there were material considerations that overrode the adopted policies in this case, officers did not consider that these considerations were compelling to justify a departure to the development plan. As such the application was not considered to be acceptable and was recommended for refusal.

The first of two speakers on this application was Councillor Phil Kidney, the local Member. He explained that he had lived in Jameston for 40 years and believed that the proposal was well related to the village, which had very good bus and train routes to Pembroke and Tenby. The village was experiencing tough times and businesses could only benefit from extra footfall. The application in question would not be in receipt of any grant aid, and he applauded Mr Staniland for his efforts to help the economic wellbeing of the village. Councillor Kidney did not believe that the proposals would be displacing, but complementing, existing businesses, and would secure jobs in the village’s pubs and shop, as the wigwams could be used year round and would attract outdoor



enthusiasts. Although the site was just outside the Local Development Plan's development limit for Jameston, he believed that this was outweighed by the economic arguments. The site was discretely hidden and would only be visible from Beavers Hill, whose residents saw the proposals as positive, not negative. He stated that one of the National Park's purposes was to foster the social and economic wellbeing of the National Park and there were no objections to the application from anyone in the village or the Community Council. The existing business had to diversify or it would shrink and close resulting in the loss of jobs, rather than their creation. He concluded by inviting the Committee to visit the site.

The second speaker was Mr Ashley Staniland, who explained that he was the youngest of two sons working at Brumwells, which had been based at Jameston for 30 years. Due to recent changes in the business, it was necessary to seek other ways to keep the business alive. The proposed wigwams were not caravans, tents or yurts and were capable of all year occupation; it was intended to continue to run the existing business. A previous application had been refused as contrary to policy, issues regarding septic drainage and loss of trees. The revised application therefore reduced the number of trees to be lost and proposed mains foul drainage. Mr Staniland believed that the application would meet the objectives in the Pembrokeshire Destination Management Plan which had been approved by the Authority; it was sustainable as the site adjoined the village, which had a shop and was also on a bus route. He considered that the development would be well screened from all angles and the visual impact on the National Park would be minimal, especially when compared to the many wind turbines that had been approved. No new planning unit would be created and he considered the site to be brownfield, not open countryside. The proposals would allow jobs to be retained and allow him to remain living and working in Pembrokeshire, rather than leave. He believed that Pembrokeshire was going through a hard time and it was necessary to harness the potential of tourism. He did not believe it was right that young people had to leave the community as family life was the lifeblood of the community - empty homes resulted in ghost towns and school closures.

The Director of Park Direction and Planning cautioned Members against giving consideration to the novelty value of wigwams, pointing out that there were some 90 thousand bed spaces in Pembrokeshire and the need was to raise the quality of the existing provision, rather than provide additional tourist accommodation. However one Members disagreed that the wigwams could be classed as caravans and thought that, as something different, they would appeal to families and the development would lift the economy of Jameston by supporting the local businesses. Another Member believed that the Destination Management Plan



supported the need for product improvement and new products in response to changing tastes and trends. Both considered that a site visit would assist Members' understanding and this was moved and seconded. Members questioned whether the site was within domestic curtilage and whether that was material, to which officers replied that the site was part of the amenity of the house, however this was outside of the development limit and the application was for a change of use of the land.

DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow Members to undertake a site visit.

[Ms C Gwyther tendered her apologies at this juncture and left the meeting]

- (I) REFERENCE: NP/14/0664
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs M Tufnall
PROPOSAL: Amendment to the design of the replacement dwelling consented under NP/13/0442 due to removal of basement, 2 single storey lean-to extensions to house storage and a plant room. New outbuilding
LOCATION: Carneithan, St Davids, Haverfordwest

It was reported that the application site comprised a solitary detached dwelling located in a countryside setting on the headland overlooking Whitesands Bay. The existing dwelling sat facing the track, which was also a public footpath and bridleway, and was visible in the immediate setting. Planning permission had originally been granted for a replacement dwelling in 2013 – the original one and a half storey dwelling was to be replaced with a new dwelling which comprised a design which was both traditional in form and very modern in detailing.

The current application sought to amend the original design by removing the basement element and constructing two single storey lean-to extensions to the rear of the dwelling and to construct a single storey turf roof outbuilding to its north. The proposed amendments had arisen as it was found that there was bedrock beneath the dwelling which would prevent a basement from being created.

Following consultation, St Davids City Council had objected to the proposal on the grounds that the Council considered that the scale of the amendments differed vastly from the original plans submitted and that the proposed design was deemed likely to have a detrimental visual impact on the surrounding area. It was reported at the meeting there had been no response to the public consultation and no other objections had been received from statutory consultees.



Officers considered that the proposal was still acceptable – the replacement dwelling incorporated very modern design and construction with a more traditional pitched roof form. The more organic elements of the design would be in keeping with the prevailing natural outcrop forms and features within the landscape, and the compact form of the dwelling would be an acceptable form of development which was appropriate and compatible with the existing setting. Ample private parking and amenity space was available to the property. As such officers considered that the proposal could be supported and the recommendation was of approval subject to conditions.

There was one speaker on this application, Mr McMorran, the agent. He explained that the original design was for a house with a basement, however ground investigations had found that the original dwelling was built on sand with bedrock below, this meant that a basement was impractical. Given that raising the level of the house was not viable in the National Park, and the need to minimise service and storage at ground level, it was proposed to build two small lean-to storage buildings; such outbuildings were considered to be a traditional form of extension. A plant room and storage area beneath a turf roof were also proposed at the rear, between the house and hedge. This was a significant reduction in the floor area and considered to be sympathetic and to have a minimal impact on the National Park. Mr McMorran considered this to be an outstanding new home that combined traditional and contemporary with low energy use.

One Member asked about the height of the proposed dwelling. Officers replied that the proposed dwelling was the same height as that permitted by the existing permission, however the height could be tied to AOD (Above Ordnance Datum) by condition.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to a time limit for implementation, built in accordance with drawings, bat mitigation measures, landscaping conditions, highway safety conditions and tying the height of the building to Ordnance Datum.

[Councillor M Williams tendered his apologies at this juncture and left the meeting.]

8. Appeals

The Head of Development Management reported on 2 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.

9. Subordinate Legislation Relating to Certain Internal Operations (Mezzanine Floors)

It was reported that at its meeting on 17th December 2014, the National Park Authority delegated consideration of the above mentioned consultation to the Development Management Committee. The consultation was considered to be straightforward in that it proposed the commencement of Section 49 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which allowed secondary regulations to be introduced bringing the formation of 200sqm or more of additional internal floorspace within retail premises (mezzanine floors) within the meaning of development.

On this basis, planning permission would now be required for such increases. The only specific comment concerned the fact that in sensitive areas such as National Parks or conservation areas, a smaller threshold for the meaning of development might be appropriate. The Authority's full response to the consultation was appended to the report, and the Director of Park Direction and Planning added that this response would also be sent on behalf of National Parks Wales.

DECISION: That the draft response to the consultation on Subordinate Legislation relating to certain internal operations (mezzanine floors) as attached to the report, be approved as the Authority, and also National Parks Wales' response to this consultation.

