

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

8 June 2016

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)

Mr D Ellis, Councillor ML Evans, Councillor L Jenkins, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor RM Lewis, Councillor PJ Morgan, 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 – 11.45am]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Mr A Archer, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor P Harries, Councillor S Hudson and Councillor M James. It was noted that Councillor James was attending the National Parks UK Executive in the Broads on behalf of the Authority.

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(f)below</i> NP/16/0170 - Construction of new Marine Centre, including marine workshops, marine/outdoor action retail, café & restaurant, offices for harbour administration & Wales Tourism, RYA Academy, Teaching Rooms, Coastal Storm Education Centre, bedrooms & disabled accommodation – Harbour Office, the Harbour, Saundersfoot	Mr AE Sangster	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 20 April 2016 and 9 May 2016 were presented for confirmation and signature.



It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on the 20 April 2016 and 9 May 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/16/083/FUL <i>Minute 6(b) refers</i>	Alterations & extensions comprising stepped extensions to the rear elevation, an extension of existing single storey element to the west gable and new dormer windows to the front roof elevation – Paulfryn, St Brides Lane, Saundersfoot	Cllr Phil Baker – County Councillor
NP/16/113/FUL <i>Minute 6(c) refers</i>	Extensions & alterations to dwelling to provide additional living space & bedroom accommodation – Efor Grug, Ffordd Cilgwyn, Newport	Mrs Paula Frost - Applicant
NP/16/0123/OUT <i>Minute 6(d) refers</i>	Rounding off dwelling – Land adjacent to Rushmead, Meadow Lane, Nolton Haven	Mrs Jenny Wilson - Applicant
NP/16/0170/FUL <i>Minute 6(f) refers</i>	Construction of new Marine Centre, including marine workshops, marine/outdoor action retail, café & restaurant, offices for harbour administration & Wales Tourism, RYA	Mr Michael Davies - Applicant



Academy, Teaching Rooms,
Coastal Storm Education
Centre, bedrooms &
disabled accommodation –
Harbour Office, The
Harbour, Saundersfoot

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 Director of Planning, 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/16/047/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr P Owen, Pembrokeshire Housing Association
PROPOSAL: 2 x 4-person 2-bedroom houses
LOCATION: Land at Peasey Park, Sandyke Road, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when it was resolved to carry out a site inspection in order to view the location of the proposal.

Officers previously reported that they considered the proposed development, while located on land defined as open space, was



appropriate as an exception site for affordable housing, given its proximity to the Rural Centre of Broad Haven. The loss of open space had been assessed and was considered acceptable in this instance, as the area was small in scale and adequate open space provision for Broad Haven would remain.

The proposed development was residential in character and was compatible with the existing residential setting which bordered the site. The dwellings themselves formed a semi-detached set piece, which was considered to form a natural rounding off of the existing two-storey dwellings to the east of the site. The design was simple and unfussy, using traditional detailing, and was of an external appearance that would be appropriate within the existing range of architectural styles at this location.

Clarification had been sought at the previous meeting and site inspection regarding land ownership, privacy and overshadowing of adjacent dwellings, and further information on these points was contained within the officers' report.

In conclusion, officers considered that the proposed development was appropriate to the site and setting in terms of siting, design, access, landscaping and external appearance and would be in accordance with national and local planning policy. It was therefore recommended that the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to the interested person(s) first entering into a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement in respect of the provision of affordable housing and subject to conditions relating to timing of development, accordance with plans, finished levels, construction method statement, lighting, boundary treatments, foul and surface water drainage, landscaping, footpath link, parking, undergrounding of cables and removal of permitted development rights.

Some Members remained concerned about the height of the proposed dwellings and their dominance and the consequent intrusion to the privacy of neighbouring properties, considering that dormer bungalows would be more appropriate. It was alternatively suggested that the area should be left as an open space which would allow the sports association to possibly develop further sporting facilities in the future. A motion for refusal of the application was moved and seconded. The question was asked that if the application was refused and subsequently appealed, how could affordable housing be secured on the site. Officers advised that lack of affordable housing would have to be listed as a reason for refusal and the motion was amended to include this as a reason.



Other Members, however pointed out that that there was plenty of open space in the village and argued that it would be difficult to provide houses for families on the site if only one and a half storey dwellings were permitted. The distance between the rear of the proposed dwellings and the rear of the dwellings in Puffin Way was clarified as being 22m and this was considered to be a reasonable distance. The application presented a good opportunity to provide affordable homes in the area and its approval was moved and seconded.

A vote was then taken for refusal of the application and this was lost. The motion to delegate approval to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to the interested person(s) first entering into a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement in respect of the provision of affordable housing and subject to conditions as set out in the report was then voted upon, and this was carried.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to the interested person(s) first entering into a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement in respect of the provision of affordable housing and subject to conditions relating to timing of development, accordance with plans, finished levels, construction method statement, lighting, boundary treatments, foul and surface water drainage, landscaping, footpath link, parking, undergrounding of cables and removal of permitted development rights.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/16/0083/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs S & C Lander
PROPOSAL: Alterations & extensions comprising stepped extensions to the rear elevation, an extension over existing single storey element to the west gable and new dormer windows to the front roof elevation
LOCATION: Paulfryn, St Brides Lane, Saundersfoot

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when it was resolved to carry out a site inspection in order to view the location of the proposal.

Concerns had been expressed by objectors about overshadowing, and the agent had produced “sun path” illustrations which were shown to the Committee.

Officers concluded by reiterating that the proposed extension was not considered to be overbearing in massing and would not have an adverse impact on the existing character of the main house. Adequate private



amenity and parking space would be available to the property, and the extension would not have an adverse impact on issues of amenity and privacy. The proposal would meet national and local policy requirements and the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, construction method statement and windows to elevations facing neighbouring properties/balcony screen to be retained as obscure glazing.

County Councillor Phil Baker then addressed the Committee. He said that he was Chair of the Community Council and wished to explain the concerns of the Community Council which was in favour of modern design, but in the right location. The extension was considered to be too large and the design was described as monolithic. There would be impacts during construction on the un-adopted lane and on neighbouring properties and gardens as the two terrace levels would bring the extension further forward than at present. Councillor Baker explained that he had viewed the application site from the neighbouring properties on both sides and stated that he would not want such an extension to be built next door to him. He asked the Committee to be consistent as a large scale extension had been refused at neighbouring property "Zamboanga" due to excessive scale and mass, loss of privacy and precedent. A letter from the owner of "Merry Hill", another neighbouring property, was then read out which stated that he was not claiming he would suffer from a loss of view but that as the first floor accommodation would change from bedroom and bathroom to living accommodation there would be an impact on his property due to overlooking from that elevation. He concluded by saying that the property would be excessive in scale and mass and detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties due to its siting and design and these were material considerations.

Some Members agreed with Councillor Baker that the scale and mass of the extension were overwhelming and the design was poor. They felt it would have an adverse effect on the character of the area and would have hoped that something more aesthetically pleasing could have been designed. A motion of refusal was moved and seconded. Other Members disagreed, stating that the design was first class and the development modest. The improvements were considered to enhance the property which was old and old-fashioned and they didn't believe the proposal would affect the neighbouring properties. The recommendation for approval was moved and seconded.

A vote was taken on the motion for refusal, and this was lost; the motion for approval subject to the conditions set out in the report was then put to the vote and this was carried.



DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans, construction method statement and windows to elevations facing neighbouring properties/balcony screens to be retained as obscure glazing.

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/16/0113/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs C Frost
PROPOSAL: Extensions & alterations to dwelling to provide additional living space & bedroom accommodation
LOCATION: Efor Grug, Ffordd Cilgwyn, Newport

It was reported that this application was brought before the Committee as Newport Town Council had recommended refusal and this was contrary to the officer recommendation. Officers supported the alterations and extension on the basis that the new extensions were sensitively designed and detailed, taking into account and respecting the gradient of the landscape, and combined with the alterations to provide external cladding to the original, they provided a significant improvement in the quality of architectural detailing on the existing dwelling. The recommendation was therefore to grant planning permission subject to conditions relating to timing of development, accordance with plans, and any reasonable planning conditions that the highway authority and/or ecologist sought to impose on the planning permission.

It was reported at the meeting that the County Ecologist had originally been concerned that access points for bats were not shown adequately on the submitted plans. However revised plans had now been received which incorporated new access points and the ecologist was now happy provided that these were conditioned along with the provision of appropriately sourced sedum plants. The Highway Authority had commented that there were no proposed changes to the parking area or garage, and had not objected to the application. They had expressed concern about the potential for the extension to be used as a separate annexe to the main house, but it was noted that this would require a further planning application and was not applied for within this application.

The applicant, Mrs Paula Frost, addressed the Committee. She explained that the property had been built as a holiday home in the 1960s and since purchasing it she had increased visitor numbers and wanted to increase use of the property still further, however it did not meet modern standards and was poorly insulated. The house sat well in the landscape, being part of a group of houses, but itself largely hidden from both the Cilgwyn and A487 roads. The proposal would create en-suite bathrooms and a larger kitchen; the property would be wrapped in insulation and cladding applied to the outside with a balcony to improve access to the garden. The property would remain four bed roomed. She added that the



Architects were well known and respected within the National Park and the design would visually integrate the property into the landscape so that it did not impact on views. Mrs Frost felt that the overall proposal was positive and would not impact on neighbouring properties.

Members were happy with the proposals, believing that the cladding would improve the aspect of the property in the landscape. It was clarified that as the land was sloping, the hedgebank would conceal the development from the West. They asked if a photographic montage could be provided showing the property before and after the work had been carried out. With regard to the request of the ecologist for a condition regarding the sedum roof, Members were happy for the officer to draft a suitable condition.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions regarding time, accordance with plans and provision of appropriate sedum plants for the roof of the extension.

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/16/0123/OUT
APPLICANT: Mrs J Wilson
PROPOSAL: Rounding off dwelling
LOCATION: Land adjacent to Rushmead, Meadow Lane, Nolton Haven

Outline planning permission was sought for a single dwelling-house to be sited in Nolton Haven. The application site fell outside any Centre or Rural Centre as defined in the Local Development Plan and was thus in the countryside for policy purposes. The application was a resubmission of a proposal originally made in 2015 which was subsequently refused. The application was reported to the Committee at the request of a Member of the Committee.

Matters of access and landscaping were included in the proposal, with the remaining issues relating to appearance, layout and scale reserved for a future application.

No objections had been received to the proposal from third parties. An objection had been received from the Coal Authority, however the points it raised could be the subject of a planning condition requiring works to be carried out prior to the submission of reserved matters.

It was clarified that Nolton and Roch Community Council had written last week in support of the application.

It was reported that the application site fell within an area of designated Open Space, however at the meeting the officer pointed out that this was



more appropriately explained as land designated primarily as a green wedge, rather than an open space. The green wedge was intended to prevent further development on the northern flank of the rural road between Nolton Haven and Nolton Stables. While Local Development Plan Policy 7(a) allowed for rounding off opportunities, it was considered in this instance that the open space/green wedge designation was specifically to prevent the continuation of residential development along the lane, therefore any planning permission for rounding off here would undermine this particular policy of the development plan. In light of this, the proposal would be contrary to the policies of the Local Development Plan which sought to prevent development which would be out of keeping with the existing character of the surroundings and patterns of development at Nolton Haven and was considered to encroach onto important countryside. It was therefore recommended for refusal.

The applicant, Mrs Jenny Wilson, addressed the Committee. She explained that she had been born and brought up in Nolton and had always hoped to live there, however she had moved to Milford Haven. Her eldest child was slightly autistic, having difficulties in dealing with noisy and busy environments, and when she returned to work had therefore been looked after by Mrs Wilson's mother who lived in Nolton, attended Roch playgroup and subsequently was accepted at Roch School as it was felt a smaller school would be more beneficial to him. Her younger son would do likewise. One of the policies which the report said the application was contrary to was Policy 7 Accessibility; as her parents lived less than half a mile from the plot and the school bus passed the door, if the family were able to live in Nolton Mrs Wilson explained that her current commute of 10 miles in each direction – sometimes up to 40 miles per day – would cease. She also explained that she was still part of the community, helping at events at the Chapel, and could assist in the establishment of a youth club and Sunday school in the village as she done when she was younger. The family wanted to be part of village life.

Mrs Wilson referred to the major concern in the officers' report regarding encroachment and harmful effect on the green wedge, however she stated the site had never been allowed to grow wild and the ecological report had stated that development of the site would have minimal impact. The eastern boundary of the site was a natural hedge that had been in existence for 100 years and this was felt to be a logical boundary for development. She stated that she did not wish to cause any harm to the National Park and did not believe that the proposed development would do so but provide a logical rounding off of development in the area. She added that it was difficult for a family to get started on the housing ladder but in this situation her father was able to help. Those houses that became available in the village were out of reach but she felt that a self-build option would be more affordable. She expressed a willingness to



make a contribution towards affordable housing if required and asked the Committee, if they were in any doubt, to visit the site.

Members had sympathy with the applicant, supporting the principle of a dwelling on the site and it was suggested that, even though it did not fall within the normal definition, this dwelling could be considered as affordable housing as the site was owned by the family and would be a self-build. They did, however, consider the layout could be improved with the dwelling situated in the far corner and additional planting added to the eastern boundary, believing that this would enhance the green wedge.

Officers reminded the Committee that the application was in outline and was for an open market dwelling, not affordable housing, with the consequence that any plot granted could be sold at market value. In addition the site was located in the countryside and was a site to which the list of exceptions for affordable housing in Policy 7(a) did not apply due to its sensitive nature and consequent designation as a green wedge.

The Solicitor further advised that an applicant's personal circumstances could rarely be taken into consideration and no information had been submitted regarding this point as part of the application.

Another Member suggested that any approval could be conditioned similarly to Council houses that were sold whereby anyone purchasing the property had to have a local connection; the result of this was that the value of the plot was reduced and the sale value of the property was limited. The Director of Planning added that it was normal to expect such an agreement to be signed within 3 months and if this was not done, the application could be refused. A motion to approve the application subject to a local occupancy requirement was moved and seconded and this was carried.

The Chair then asked the Director of Planning whether she wished to apply the Authority's 'Cooling Off' procedure to this decision and she replied that she did not.

It was then moved that any application for reserved matters on this site come before the Committee for a decision and this was agreed without a vote.

DECISION: That outline planning permission be granted subject to the provision of a section 106 agreement for a local occupancy condition being completed within 3 months of the date of the committee. If not provided within 3 months, then officers would have the discretion to issue a refusal decision. Any future application for the approval of reserved matters should come to the Committee for



consideration.

[Councillor R Owens was not present when the following application was discussed]

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/16/0145
APPLICANT: Pembrokeshire Coast National Park
PROPOSAL: Change of use of existing building from 'Attendants' Hut to 'Ticket' Hut
LOCATION: Attendants Hut, Oriel y Parc Car Park, St Davids

This application had been referred to the Committee as the Authority was the applicant.

The application sought approval for the change of use of an existing car park attendant's hut in the Oriel y Parc Car Park, to a ticket office with the aim of selling tickets for tourist attractions in the area. This would constitute a change of use from sui generis to A1 retail. No physical changes to the existing structure were proposed which required planning permission or advertisement consent. Officers did not consider that the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the special qualities of the National Park or neighbouring amenity. It was therefore considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan.

It was reported at the meeting that the consultation period had now expired and no comments had been received. It was therefore recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing and accordance with plans.

[Mr AE Sangster disclosed an interest in the following application and withdrew from the meeting while it was considered]

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/16/0170/FUL
APPLICANT: Harbour Commissioners Trust Port of Saundersfoot
PROPOSAL: Construction of new Marine Centre, including marine workshops, marine/outdoor action retail, café & restaurant, offices for harbour administration & Wales Tourism, RYA Academy, Teaching Rooms, Coastal Storm Education Centre, bedrooms & disabled accommodation
LOCATION: Harbour Office, The Harbour, Saundersfoot

This application was before the Committee as it was classed as major development, however it was reported at the meeting that due to an administrative error it had not originally been advertised as such and the



recommendation was therefore changed to one of delegation for approval with conditions subject to no new material considerations being raised during the revised consultation period.

The application proposed the construction of a new mixed use commercial building formed across 4 storeys and providing a RYA unit, reception, coffee shop, chandlery, toilet and wash facilities, workshop and marine engineering and external storage yard at ground floor level. Restaurant and associated kitchen and servery and bar, teaching room, toilet facilities, 10 double bedrooms, family room and disabled accommodation at first floor level, Wales coastal tourism space, toilet facilities and coastal storm centre interactive exhibition at second floor level together with staff room, changing facilities, office administration, reception, toilet facilities, harbour masters office and board room to be provided on the third storey.

Following consideration of the policies contained within the Local Development Plan (LDP) and National Planning Policy, and having regard to all material considerations, it was considered that the development offered an opportunity to improve the quality of the environment at Saundersfoot Harbour. The development would be in keeping with the aims of the LDP in that the development would conserve and enhance the existing character of the harbour and contribute positively to ensuring the long term viability of the harbour. As such, and subject to a schedule of suitable conditions to control the development finishes, officers considered the development was acceptable and complied with the requirements of the policies in the LDP.

Mr Michael Davies addressed the Committee on behalf of the Harbour Commissioners who were the applicants. He stated that this proposal marked the start of a new chapter for Saundersfoot and the region as a whole as the land and buildings on the harbour had fallen into dereliction and these proposals would revitalise the harbour area. It was hoped that the project would create a year round attraction, encouraging new and untapped tourism in respect of water and terrestrial activities with the aims of extending the season and providing new employment opportunities. He went on to explain that the harbour was held in trust on behalf of the community and the application had their key values at its heart being based on meaningful partnership and a family friendly identity and this meant that the project was able to proceed on an ambitious and sustainable course to secure an all year round tourism destination that was not weather dependant.

Following a questions from a Member, the Monitoring Officer confirmed that the funding provided to the scheme by Pembrokeshire County



Council did not fetter the Councillors on the Authority in participating in the decision-making that day.

Members asked a number of questions regarding the provision of service areas, parking and the 'Wales Coastal Tourism' space, as well as whether there would be any planning obligations related to the site. Officers explained that the application separated public from private areas and there was an external storage yard in which service activities, such as refuse storage and compaction would take place. Parking for the building would be located in the existing harbour car park. With regard to planning obligations, officers responded that these mainly related to housing sites, rather than industrial/commercial developments.

The applicant was then invited to give a short explanation of the Wales Coastal Tourism space and he explained that it was a contact centre where the public could talk, in person or electronically, to staff who would maintain a cohesive database of activities taking place around the coast of Wales.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning to issue consent subject to conditions regarding timing; accordance with plans; provision of scheme relating to emission of odour, fumes and noise; Construction Environmental Management Plan; lighting scheme; samples of materials on external surfaces; bedroom accommodation to be limited to persons using the associated teaching and training facilities; gross retail floor space not to exceed 120m²; details of solar/photovoltaic panels; and subject to no new material considerations being raised during the extended consultation period.

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/16/0186/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr G Meopham (PCNPA)
PROPOSAL: Creation of new vehicular entrance at Newport Sands Carpark to improve management
LOCATION: Newport Sands Car Park, Newport

This application was reported to the Committee as the applicant was the National Park Authority.

Planning permission was sought for the creation of a new vehicular entrance at Newport Sands car park. The work would involve breaking through and removal of a section of grassed earth bank that formed the roadside boundary, laying a new tarmac surface within the new entrance and the installation of traditionally designed timber field gate. The access



would be used during peak periods to manage traffic flow in and out of the existing car park.

No objections had been raised by either statutory or public consultees and the proposed development by reason of its nature, scale and appearance was not considered to have any adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding area, or on the special qualities of the National Park and as such complied with policies of the Local Development Plan. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to standard conditions.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time and accordance with plans.

7. Appeals

The Director of Planning reported on 8 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.

Appeal decisions for St Catherine's Island, Tenby, and Cadwaladers, Tudor Square, Tenby, both of which were allowed, were appended to the report, together with an appeal decision relating to land off The Ridgeway, Manorbier Newton, which was dismissed. The Director noted that although the appeal for St Catherine's Island had been allowed, the Inspector had retained or amended only slightly most of the conditions. Also the request for costs had been allowed for only one element of the appeal – advertisement – and she had not heard further from the applicant in that relation to the limited award..

NOTED.

8. Thanks

As it was her last meeting as Chair of the Committee, Mrs Hayward thanked both Members and Officers for their support and forbearance during her time in office, which she said had been an enjoyable and interesting experience. The Deputy Chair responded on behalf of Members and Officers by thanking the Chair for all her work during her time in office when, for her professional approach to the business of the committee and for her sensitive handling of a number of difficult matters that had come before the committee during that time.

