

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

19th October 2016

Present: Councillor RM Lewis (Chair)

Mr A Archer, Mr D Ellis, Councillor ML Evans, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor P Harries, Mrs G Hayward, Councillor S Hudson, Councillor M James, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor R Owens, Councillor D Rees, Mr AE Sangster, Mrs M Thomas, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor M Williams.

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 12.45pm]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors L Jenkins and PJ Morgan.

2. Disclosures of interest

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

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minutes 6(d)below</i> NP/16/0428 - The Nest Woodland, Picton Castle Gardens, The Rhos, Haverfordwest	Mr D Ellis	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minutes 6(e)below</i> NP/16/0440 Felin Isaf, Feidr Treginnis, St Davids	Councillor M Williams Councillor R Lewis	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
	Councillor D Rees Councillor S Hudson Councillor A Wilcox Councillor R Kilmister Councillor P Harries Councillor M James	Declared only a personal interest so remained in the meeting and played a full part in determining the application

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 7th September 2016 were presented for confirmation and signature.



It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 7th September 2016 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 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/16/0364/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Proposed dwelling (Class C3) and associated works – Zion Gardens, St Johns Hill, Tenby	Mr Kim Beynon - Applicant
NP/16/0377/FUL <i>Minute 6(b) refers</i>	Glamping site of 10 bell tents with toilet & shower block (retrospective) – Beavers Retreat, Beavers Hill, The Ridgeway, Manorbier	Mr Iwan Izzard - Applicant
NP//16/0425/FUL <i>Minute 6(c) refers</i>	Conversion of youth hostel (Sui Generis) to bunkhouse (Sui Generis), cafe (A3), managers accommodation (C3) and bed and breakfast (C1), residents car park, engineering operations to site underground LPG tank, pv panels, new pedestrian passing place, landscaping and associated works. Youth Hostels Association, Marloes, Haverfordwest	Mr Chris Jessop (Marloes & St Brides Community Council) – Objector Mr Andrew Tuddenham (National Trust) – Applicant
NP/16/0428 <i>Minute 6(d) refers</i>	Establishment of Bird of Prey Visitor Centre with erection of 35 Aviary buildings, 1 feed store room	Ms Mary Sinclair – Chairman of Pembrokeshire Branch of CPRW



	& ticket office in the Woodland Gardens – The Nest Woodland, Picton Castle Gardens, The Rhos, Haverfordwest	– Objector
NP/16/0440/FUL <i>Minute 6(e) refers</i>	Retrospective application for yurt, platform & washroom and interpretation panel – Felin Isaf, Feidr Treginnis, St Davids	Cllr Christopher Taylor– on behalf of St Davids City Council - supporter

5. 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. The duty of the Authority carry out sustainable development in accordance with Part 2 of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 was also highlighted. 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

6. Report of Planning Applications

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Development Management Team Leader, 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/16/0364/FUL
 APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Beynon
 PROPOSAL: Proposed dwelling (Class C3) and associated works
 LOCATION: Zion Gardens, St Johns Hill, Tenby

It was reported that this site lay centrally within Tenby, and was enclosed by a substantial dressed stone wall. It currently benefitted from a



temporary consent for seven static caravans which had been situated on the site under a variety of temporary consents since first given planning approval for redevelopment in the 1970s.

Officers considered the single dwelling proposed to be an under-development of the site, which could accommodate multiple dwellings and also allow for on-site affordable housing provision. The proposal was also considered out of character with the scale and density of surrounding residential development. It was therefore considered that the application as submitted was an inappropriate development on this site and was not supported. The application was reported to the Committee as the Town Council had expressed a contrary view.

It was reported at the meeting that in relation to affordable housing, valuations and bill cost assessments had now been received, and at both medium and high end specifications for the proposed dwelling, payment of a commuted sum had been shown not to be viable. However officers considered that the build costs related to this particular scheme were high, due, for example, to its underground parking. The potential for multiple dwellings on the site with on-site provision for affordable housing had not been explored.

Turning to design, the rear elevation had been amended during the course of the application to take account of the concerns of neighbouring properties. The amended design had been circulated and no further comments had been received. Officers stressed that the modern nature of the design was not a problem in itself, however the key determinant of good design was for the right building in the right location. The density of dwellings in the surrounding area was much greater than on the proposed site and the dwelling would therefore be out of character.

Finally it was noted that at the request of Dyfed Archaeological Trust the Authority had consulted Cadw regarding the proximity of a Scheduled Ancient Monument. However it had transpired that no such Monument existed and there was therefore no reason for Cadw to comment on the application. The officer added that the recommendation remained one of refusal and she recommended that for clarity three reasons be given (rather than the two set out in the report): underdevelopment of the site, density being out of character with the surrounding area and lack of provision of affordable housing.

The applicant, Mr Kim Beynon, then addressed the Committee. He explained that the site at Zion Gardens had been in his ownership for 55 years and it currently contained 12 dwellings, 9 of which were let to local people at affordable rents, as well as several caravans. The application had been supported by Tenby Town Council and Civic Society and the



objection from the neighbouring property had been dealt with. There were therefore no concerns within the local area or in relation to privacy/amenity. The specification to the architects had been for a highly sustainable building and an outstanding family home and there appeared to be agreement that the design was excellent. The site was difficult to develop due to a number of constraints including a tree preservation order, the existence of other trees, the stone boundary walls which could not be undermined and the Welsh Water storm drain. Access for construction was difficult also due to the unsuitable entrance and the stone walls made the site unique and therefore different from the surrounding developments. Mr Beynon could not see the relevance of Policy 30 to the application. He noted that the height of the building reflected the topography of the site and the floating foundations were required due to the constraints. He disagreed that it was poorly designed in response to its setting as the limestone wall enclosures would match those of the walled garden. With regard to affordable housing, Mr Beynon explained that it had been long and drawn out process due to the different zones identified for the commuted sum, however the complexity of the site had resulted in high development costs. In conclusion he stated that the constraints of the site prevented multiple dwellings being located on it and there was a mix of building types, scale and density in the area and he believed the modern innovative design solution would provide a break from the traditional Tenby 'pastiche'. There would also be a clear planning gain due to redevelopment of the current caravan site.

While not unhappy with the modernistic design of the dwelling, several Members stated that the size and scale of the property was not in keeping with the density of the dwellings in the surrounding area. Although it was acknowledged that there were other houses in large gardens, it was noted that the dwelling in this case took up the complete footprint of the site, and it was suggested that this was at the expense of providing affordable housing. Even if no affordable housing was to be built on the site, several Members felt that a contribution towards affordable housing through payment of a commuted sum should be made. A motion to refuse the application was moved and seconded.

Other Members, however, supported the development, which they considered would have no detrimental visual impact as it was surrounded by a walled garden. The issue of overlooking had been addressed and the design was modern and innovative and should be embraced. There would also be a planning gain due to removal of the caravan site which was they considered was inappropriately located. Some disagreed with the argument regarding under-development of the site given the constraints. However it was moved that the application be approved subject to payment of a commuted sum by the applicant, as well as other



conditions on which the advice of officers was sought; these to include agreement of floor levels. This was seconded.

Before voting on the amendment to approve the application, the Solicitor suggested that the motion be amended to that of delegation to approve subject to agreement of a S106 Agreement within 3 months and other suitable conditions. This was agreed by those who had proposed and seconded the motion and it was duly amended. A vote was then taken but this was lost.

A vote was then taken on the substantive motion for refusal of the application, the reasons relating to underdevelopment of the site, the density being out of character with the surrounding area and lack of provision of affordable housing.

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

- 1. The proposed development represents an inefficient use of land, comprising the underdevelopment of a site on which the Local Development Plan requires a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. As such, the proposal is contrary to Pembrokeshire Coast Local Development Plan Policy 44 and paragraphs 4.11.6, 9.2.12, and 9.3.4 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 8, January 2016).**
- 2. The proposed dwelling is out of character with the scale and density of the surroundings, and as such is in conflict with the principles of good design as espoused by Welsh Government guidance within TAN12, Planning Policy Wales (Edition 8, January 2016), and Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan Policy 2, criteria a and e, Policy 8 b, Policy 44, Policy 15 a and b.**
- 3. The alternative provision of on-site affordable provision through development of the site for multiple units has not been demonstrated. As such the proposal is contrary to LDP Policies 2 and 45 of the Local development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance 04.**



- (b) REFERENCE: NP/16/0377/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr Izzard
PROPOSAL: Glamping site of 10 bell tents with toilet & shower block (retrospective)
LOCATION: Beavers Retreat, Beavers Hill, The Ridgeway, Manorbier

This application was reported to the Committee at the request of one of its Members as it was considered that the application would assist the economic stability of Jameston and the surrounding area, and would boost the choice of holiday accommodation in the Pembrokeshire area.

The application site comprised land located in an open countryside setting, north of the village of Jameston. Planning permission was sought in retrospect for the use of the land as a seasonal campsite, together with the provision of ancillary facilities comprising gas powered showers and compost toilets.

The proposal had been considered against the policies of the current Local Development Plan, and while the applicant had sought to justify the retention of the campsite, the main Local Development Plan Policy 38 – Camping Touring Caravans, Statics and Chalet sites – which is relevant to the consideration of this proposal – is clear that no new camping sites would be supported. There were no material considerations put forward by the applicant that would be considered to outweigh the very clear policy position regarding such developments. As such the application could not be supported by officers and the recommendation was of refusal.

Mr Iwan Izzard, the applicant, then addressed the Committee. He began by apologising that the application was retrospective, however he wanted to assess the viability of the business prior to submitting an application. He also hoped that the information packs that he had circulated prior to the meeting had been helpful. In these he had explained that having finished in University he had wanted to return to live in Pembrokeshire, however jobs were limited, and the business provided him with a reliable income which would allow him to live in the area. He explained that his family farmed the land, however this was not viable and his father supplemented his own income by undertaking garden maintenance. Therefore the business was a diversification of the farm, rather than taking land out of agriculture. Mr Izzard noted that the site could not be seen from neighbouring properties and was kept clean and tidy; it was intended to make it disabled friendly. It provided an affordable means of holiday accommodation, mainly for families, and there had been no complaints regarding noise. The business supported other businesses in



the locality as guests often ate in local pubs and restaurants. The site was small scale and the positives outweighed the negatives.

One Member asked Mr Izzard whether the toilets/showers could be moved out of season and he replied that they could be and that there were currently sheep grazing in the field.

The Member who had asked that the application come before the Committee began by explaining that although the site was not in his area, he had visited the site when the tents were up, and he thought it looked idyllic, safe for children as there was no electricity, and this also meant that it would not attract teenage groups. He believed it would allow young families to have an affordable holiday in Pembrokeshire, as not all could afford 5* hotels or even campsites. The site helped to maintain services in the village of Jameston and was close to excellent beaches. In winter the site was cleared. Although he did not condone the retrospective nature of the application, he understood the applicants' need to establish the viability of the business before seeking planning permission. He asked Members to visit the site before refusing permission, however he moved that the application be approved and this was seconded.

The next Member spoke in support of the officer recommendation, stating that the application was clearly against National Park policy, and the reasons for that policy remained – that there were too many pitches and their number exceeded demand. The policy therefore prevented proliferation of intrusive sites having a detrimental impact on the landscape of the National Park. Some Members went on to express reservations about the policy. It was suggested that there were material considerations that outweighed the policy, namely the low-impact, seasonal nature of the business and job creation. They believed that the business was successful because there was a demand for this type of accommodation. It was also suggested that the business should be considered as farm diversification, however officers explained that no information about this was submitted with the application. They added that granting permission for camping in the open countryside set a dangerous precedent and could allow a proliferation of such sites, some of which could have more permanency, noting that this site would not be entirely cleared during the winter as there had been a request from Natural Resources Wales for a permanent foul water drainage system should the application be granted planning permission..

Other Members agreed that this was a campsite by any other name and on the basis of fair play to other people who wished to establish similar enterprises, but who had not because they knew they would be contrary to policy, they felt that the application should be refused.



The Director of Planning explained to Members that if the vote was in favour of approval she would invoke the cooling off period, as she had done on a similar application nearby earlier in the year. Before taking a vote on the motion for approval of the application, the Chairman asked for reasons for going against policy; these were given as the low-impact and seasonal nature of the enterprise, job creation and support for the economy of the area.

There were 7 votes in favour of approval and 7 against, with one abstention, therefore on the Chairman's casting vote, approval of the application was lost. Taking the substantive motion for refusal of the application, this was won 7 votes to 6, again with 1 abstention.

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

- 1. Policy 35 and 38 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan state that new camping, caravanning, static caravan or chalet sites will not be permitted in the National Park. The provision of the seasonal campsite and associated development is therefore contrary to adopted Local Development Plan Policy.**

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/16/0425/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr J Pearson, National Trust Wales
PROPOSAL: Conversion of youth hostel (Sui Generis) to bunkhouse (Sui Generis), cafe (A3), managers accommodation (C3) and bed and breakfast (C1), residents car park, engineering operations to site underground LPG tank, pv panels, new pedestrian passing place, landscaping and associated works.
LOCATION: Youth Hostels Association, Marloes, Haverfordwest

It was reported that the application site was a former farmstead consisting of a farmhouse and a series of outbuildings located to the north of Marloes sands. The site was used as a Youth Hostel until April 2015. The application proposed to change the use of the youth hostel and associated buildings to a bunkhouse facility, café, manager's accommodation and bed and breakfast, with associated car parking, pv panels and engineering operations for an underground LPG tank. The proposed development would allow for the continued use of the site as tourist accommodation in the form of a bunkhouse and would provide enhanced visitor facilities in the form of the café and bed and breakfast facility. The proposed development was considered to maintain the special qualities of the National Park and complied with the Local Development Plan policies. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.



The application was before the Committee due to the objection from Marloes and St Brides Community Council which was contrary to the officer recommendation. However it was reported at the meeting that following receipt of amended plans the Community Council had advised that it was willing to withdraw its objection if a condition was imposed removing permitted development rights from the café to restrict its use. The officer also added that the word 'spouse' had been omitted from condition 3 in her recommendation.

The first of two speakers was Mr Chris Jessop on behalf of Marloes and Brides Community Council. He explained that it welcomed the bunkhouse redevelopment, which would provide affordable accommodation for the area and coast path users in particular, however it wished to protect existing facilities. Mr Jessop explained that the shop and post office was open all year, however the village could not support two shops and it was feared that under permitted development rights the café could be converted to a shop. He said that the Community Council had not received any commitment that this change would not take place. He added that while the objection regarding disabled parking had been withdrawn, he hoped that this could still be improved.

Councillor R Owens added that having attended the meeting of the Community Council he had been aware of its concerns and had spoken to Pembrokeshire County Council's Access Officer who was prepared to meet on site to see if it was possible to locate disabled parking closer to the café entrance.. This would be of benefit to those attending the café. Officers clarified that the application could not be conditioned in this respect as no plan was yet available, however the applicant could submit a non-material amendment.

The second speaker was Mr Andrew Tuddenham from the National Trust. He explained that in bringing forward the scheme, the Trust had applied several principles – creation of a viable use that was sympathetic to the character of the building, encouraging people to return to the peninsular and meeting the needs of the community. In sharing their thoughts and plans with the community, he believed that a strong scheme had been achieved and he was grateful to the Community Councillors for their input. Mr Tuddenham believed that the application was in accordance with policy and would adhere to all planning and building regulations. He also clarified that the Trust were willing to accept the removal of permitted development rights to prevent conversion of the café to a shop.

One Member asked about the detailing of the windows, and lighting, on what was described as a stunning range of vernacular buildings. The officer drew attention to condition 6 which required details of all



fenestration to be submitted and noted that lighting was covered as part of condition 7.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans, restricting use of café, limiting use of the Manager's accommodation including spouse, surface water drainage, details of fenestration and solar panels, details of hard and soft landscape work and planting.

[Mr D Ellis disclosed an interest and withdrew from the meeting while the following application was considered]

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/16/0428
APPLICANT: Mrs E Hill, Pembrokeshire Falconry Ltd
PROPOSAL: Establishment of Bird of Prey Visitor Centre with erection of 35 Aviary buildings, 1 feed store room & ticket office in the Woodland Gardens
LOCATION: The Nest Woodland, Picton Castle Gardens, The Rhos, Haverfordwest

Planning permission was sought for the creation of a Bird of Prey visitor attraction within an area of the Grade II* listed Picton Castle gardens known as Bluebell Wood. The site consisted of a medieval castle with an extensive curtilage of approximately 40 acres that contained several listed buildings and was also in the vicinity of the scheduled ancient monument known as Picton Castle Mound.

The proposal consisted of 35 aviary structures of varying sizes and forms to be constructed from close timber boarding, profile sheeting on the roof and aviary mesh, together with a single weighing room building and a ticket office/shop building constructed of the same materials. All are to be linked with a newly constructed wheelchair accessible path constructed from compacted hardcore.

At the time of writing the report, no objections had been received and it was reported at the meeting that a recommendation of support had been received from the Community Council and no objection subject to submission of a lighting scheme from Natural Resources Wales (NRW). However a number of objections had been received from neighbours, from visitors of the historic gardens as well as neighbouring farmers, estate owners and the Chairman of the Pembrokeshire Branch of the Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (CPRW). These objections were largely based on the impact that it was alleged the birds of prey would have on local wild birds as well as birds kept for game shooting and poultry farming, in addition to the risk they posed to members of the public, particularly young children. These objections had been



considered and were addressed within the report, however no evidence had been provided to support these concerns, particularly as the flying of the birds of prey had been ongoing at the site for several years with no apparent ill-effects, and due to no objections being received from consultees, they could not be considered planning reasons for refusal of the proposal.

Officers considered that the principle of the proposal was supported by policies of the Local Development Plan (LDP) and as such the recommendation was of approval subject to conditions. The Director of Planning considered that as a Member and senior employee of the Authority were Trustees of Picton Castle, it was in the interests of transparency that the application was considered by the Committee.

There was one speaker on the application, Mrs Mary Sinclair, Chairman of the Pembrokeshire Branch of CPRW who was also speaking on behalf of the objectors. She stated that people were unhappy that the birds, which included vultures, hawks and kites, would be free flying. While the application stated that the birds were already flown daily, Mrs Sinclair contended that displays took place two or three times per week using only a few birds, not all 35. There was only one letter of support, but 27 of objection and these were concerned to protect the population of small birds in the area as well as the free range commercial enterprises located nearby. They were particularly concerned about the 'terror' effect cited in a raptor study - it was noted that Pembrokeshire Falconry already hired out their birds for pest control. In addition there was concern for the waterfowl on the Cleddau. Objectors feared that the woodland would change due to the intensification of the existing use, and Mrs Sinclair believed that policies 10 and 11 and 15 of the LDP were of relevance. She believed that the use was incompatible and requested that if Members were minded to approve the application a temporary consent should be issued so that work with local residents and farms could assess its impact.

Members asked whether a Management Plan had been submitted by the applicants and also whether RSPB had been consulted on the application. Officers replied that no Management Plan had been submitted but that to request one did not seem reasonable. In addition, in order to see if there was a reduction in the number of small birds, there would have to be a base line; there was no evidence that such a survey existed and this would in any case be difficult to obtain as the birds had been flown at Picton Castle for eight years. Also the Authority's statutory advisor was NRW, with RSPB being an interest group. One Member did suggest that maybe a temporary permission would be wise, however the Committee was reminded by officers that the flying of birds did not require planning permission. In addition the birds were taken to a variety of



venues for displays and a two year study was unlikely to be of benefit as, for example a couple of bad winters could show a detrimental effect on the local small bird population which was not influenced by the flying of the birds of prey.

The Chairman added that he had attended the public meeting and had found it very helpful. A local gamekeeper had spoken and he had said that there was only 1 species of bird of prey that he had any concerns about and did not think that the birds would be a threat to his pheasants. Also the birds were currently housed near Narberth and there was a welfare issue in transporting them to Picton Castle on a regular basis.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans, lighting mitigation strategy, details of construction design and excavations to take account of existing trees and details of the CCTV.

[Councillor M Williams tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture, having disclosed an interest in the application. Councillor R Lewis also disclosed an interest and withdrew while the application was considered. Councillor R Owens, the Deputy Chair, assumed the Chair in his absence]

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/16/0440/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs D Lloyd
PROPOSAL: Retrospective application for yurt, platform & washroom and interpretation panel
LOCATION: Felin Isaf, Feidr Treginnis, St Davids

A retrospective planning application had been received for a seasonal Mongolian yurt, a permanent timber decked platform and timber shed with associated parking to provide a seasonal camping venture. The site was located within a valley which ran from St Davids to Porthclais and was adjacent to the St Davids Mill Leat, which was both a scheduled ancient monument and a listed structure.

Officers considered that the application was contrary to policies of the Local Development Plan which sought to restrict the development of new camping sites, and development which was insensitively located within historic landscapes. As such the proposal was recommended for refusal.

Members sought clarification from the Monitoring Officer as the applicant was County Councillor D Lloyd. They were advised that while it may be appropriate for them to declare a personal interest, as the applicant was known to them, unless they knew him well the interest was unlikely to be prejudicial.



At the meeting, the officer updated the Committee with regard to a further response from Natural Resources Wales objecting on the basis of flooding. She added that the application also sought to manage the land, particularly clearance of the leat, through a S106 Agreement which would result in the yurt becoming more visible. As there was already a tourism income from the site, she felt that there were other options for supporting land management. She also recommended an additional reason for refusal – that of specific precedent – as a pre-app on this site had sought advice on locating 3 yurts and she felt that further development on the site would be difficult to resist.

There was one speaker, Mr Chris Taylor, Mayor of St Davids, who was speaking on behalf of the City Council. It had resolved to support the application on the grounds that the proposal was unlikely to have a detrimental visual or environmental impact. They believed that it would encourage tourism and generate employment thus supporting social and economic wellbeing. The Council was also conscious that granting permission would ensure protection of the mill leat, a scheduled ancient monument, through its clearance and maintenance of the vegetation, noting that the applicant had been in discussion with Cadw over long term conservation of the site. Being crossed by a bridleway also meant there was an opportunity for information to be provided to the public regarding the history of the site. The applicant was also concerned with sustaining biodiversity of the site and had commissioned a consultant's report. He felt that as only one yurt was involved this would have very low environmental impact in line with the County's sustainable tourism policy. The City Council also pointed out that the yurt was for seasonal use only and only the base platform would remain in winter. He concluded by saying that if approved, the application would ensure the viability of the existing business and improve management of the site and he asked Members to support it.

Members asked about the connection between the leat and the yurt and the officer explained that income from the yurt would be used to clear the leat and this would be provided for through a S106 Agreement. However she did not believe there was a direct link between the two and felt there were other options for its maintenance.

Several Members felt that for consistency of the application of adopted policy similarly with the application for a campsite considered earlier in the meeting they could not support the application. They also noted that the site was historic and tranquil and therefore highly sensitive. There would be detrimental impact as the base would remain all year round and a single yurt would not bring great benefit to the economy to outweigh this harm. The recommendation of refusal was moved and seconded.



Officers clarified that as the site was a scheduled ancient monument, it carried no permitted development rights and therefore the 28 day rule for tents did not apply. There followed some discussion regarding insertion of the word 'precedent' in the recommendation and the officer clarified that that the precedent related to this particular site rather than in the National Park more generally. Therefore the wording 'and would set a dangerous precedent on this site' was added to the second reason for refusal.

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

- 1. Policies 1, 8, 15 and 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seek to protect and enhance the pattern and diversity of the landscape, and prevent development that fails to harmonise with or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park; that fails to incorporate traditional features; that is insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape; and is visually intrusive. The proposed development – due to its location and siting – forms a visually intrusive and alien feature in the landscape, which is harmful to the special qualities of the National Park, and therefore is contrary to adopted development plan Policy 8, criteria a, c, and d, Policy 11 and Policy 15, criteria a, b, c, and d.**
- 2. Policy 35 and 38 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan state that new camping, caravanning, static caravan or chalet sites will not be permitted in the National Park. The provision of a new campsite and associated development is therefore contrary to adopted Development Plan Policy and would set a dangerous precedent on this site.**
- 7. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 4 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.

The officer noted that two appeals (a hearing and an Inquiry) would take place at Llanion Park and agreed to circulate the time of the meetings to members.

NOTED.

