

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

16 December 2015

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)

Mr A Archer, Mr D Ellis, Councillor ML Evans, Councillor P Harries, Councillor M James, Councillor L Jenkins, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor RM Lewis, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor D Rees, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor M Williams.

*[Mrs M Thomas arrived prior to consideration of the Solicitor's Report (Minute 6 refers), and Ms C Gwyther arrived during consideration of NP/15/0363 (Minute 7(a) refers)]*

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 12.20pm]

## 1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Hudson and Councillor R Owens.

## 2. Disclosures of interest

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

<b>Application and Reference</b>	<b>Member(s)/Officer(s)</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
<i>Minutes 7(b)below</i> NP/15/0553 Ty Cornel, Ffordd Cilgwyn, Newport	Councillor P Harries	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minutes 7(c)below</i> NP/15/0595 Tregurnow, Parrog Road, Newport	Councillor P Harries	Disclosed a personal but not prejudicial interest and took full part in the application
<i>Minutes 7(f)below</i> NP/15/0571 Pengawse Isaf, Mountain West, Newport	Councillor P Harries	Disclosed a personal but not prejudicial interest and took full part in the application

## 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 11 November 2015 were presented for confirmation and signature.



The Chairman pointed out that as she was not present at the previous meeting, the Deputy Chair had been Chairman. She noted that at Minute 6(a) and Minute 10 he had been incorrectly referred to as the Deputy Chairman.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 11 November 2015 be confirmed and signed subject to the above amendments.

**NOTED.**

**4. Matters Arising**

NP/15/0194 Land off Feidr Eglwys, Newport

Councillor M James apologised that at the last meeting he had said something that was incorrect regarding the above mentioned application. However he noted that this had not made any difference to the way he had reached his decision.

**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 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak (*the interested parties are listed below against their respective application(s), and in the order in which they addressed the Committee*):

<b>Reference number</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
NP/15/0595 <i>Minute 7(c) Refers</i>	New extensions to south east elevation & to rear elevation, new garden shed & new front canopy. New retaining wall to rear raised garden – Tregurnow, Parrog Road, Newport	Mr L Siggins, Agent
NP/15/0338 <i>Minute 7(d) refers</i>	Temporary use as car park for April 1 <sup>st</sup> to October 31 <sup>st</sup> for 3 years (2015, 2016 & 2017) – Rhosson Campsite, St Justinians	Christopher Taylor – Supporter Cllr D Lloyd – Local Councillor
NP/15/0526 <i>Minute 7(e)</i>	New Clubhouse – Buttyland Caravan Park, Station Road,	Cllr P Kidney – Local Councillor



<i>refers</i>	Manorbier	
NP/15/0571 <i>Minute 7(f)</i> <i>refers</i>	Extension & alterations including conversion of garage to granny flat & restoration of cottage front, also replacement of shed with new stable block – Pengawse Isaf, Mountain West, Newport	Edward Lambert – 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.

### NOTED

## 7. Report of Planning Applications

The Chairman informed the Committee that due to staff sickness it had been necessary to amend the running order of the agenda that day. She would therefore direct Members to the correct page at the appropriate time. The Committee went on to consider 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*):

*[Ms C Gwyther arrived during consideration of the following application, and abstained from voting as she had not heard the full debate.]*

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/15/0363/FUL  
 APPLICANT: Mr R Evans, Wentwood Property Ltd  
 PROPOSAL: Replacement dwelling  
 LOCATION: Westfields, Wisemans Bridge, Narberth

It was reported that the existing dwelling was single storey and sat immediately behind other single storey dwellings which fronted onto Cliff



Road. The house sat in a long plot bordered by mature hedgerows and trees. In the wider landscape setting, the development pattern was made up of a mix of individual dwellings located to either side of Cliff Road, and these were largely modern in appearance.

The proposed replacement dwelling would fall mainly on the footprint of the existing dwelling but was taller in height, and landscaping was to include a new timber fence to the northern elevation and the creation of three parking spaces to the front of the site. The application was before the Committee as the recommendation was contrary to that of the Community Council.

Officers considered that the proposal was acceptable as although the replacement dwelling incorporated very modern design and construction with a pitched roof form, the external materials to be used would be in keeping with those already found within the setting; private parking and amenity space was also available to the property. No long range views would be affected, however there would be an increased impact on the adjacent Willow Lodge. As a result of this, the applicant had been asked to undertake an assessment of overshadowing, however this found the impact to fall within acceptable guidelines. While the foul drainage was not via mains drainage, this was acceptable to the statutory undertakers subject to conditions.

It was reported that objections received from neighbouring properties to the north referred to concerns over the northern hedgebank. While any issues of landownership were a civil matter, its retention would be protected by condition as recommended by the Tree and Landscape Officer. As such officers considered that the proposal could be supported and the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

Some Members expressed concern over the design of the proposed dwelling and also its height and asked for a condition regarding the existing and finished floor levels of the property. Officers agreed that this could be included, but noted that the land and properties to the north were at a higher level than the proposed dwelling and there were no windows on the first floor that would cause overlooking. Members hoped that the existing poor bathing water quality at the nearby beach would not be exacerbated by the proposed foul drainage arrangements and also emphasised the need to retain the northern hedgebank.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans, agreement of samples of finishes, retention of the hedgebank, highways, ecology, landscaping, ground and finished floor levels and foul drainage.**



*[Councillor P Harries disclosed an interest in the following application and withdrew from the meeting while it was being considered.]*

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/15/0553/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Griffiths  
PROPOSAL: Extension to dwelling & erection of detached garage.  
Extension comprises sun lounge extension to western elevation & linked bedroom extension to southern elevation  
LOCATION: Ty Cornel, Ffordd Cilgwyn, Newport

Planning permission was sought for the construction of extensions and a detached garage to a detached Pembrokeshire cottage located on a rural lane off Cilgwyn Road. It was reported that in general, the extension of residential dwellings could be supported where the accommodation created was used as part of the existing dwelling, and the scale, design and appearance would respect the existing character of the host building. In this instance, the proposed extensions were traditional in proportion, but modern in design, which it was considered would contrast acceptably with the more traditional form of the existing cottage. The extensions would be of a single storey pitched roof appearance, and would be constructed of and clad in timber with glazed 'walls', and either a zinc roof (side extension and detached garage) or natural slate roof (rear extension).

No objections had been received to the proposal from statutory consultees or third parties, however Newport Town Council had objected on the grounds that the layout and density of building was too large for the plot.

Officers considered that the more modern approach taken to the extension of the cottage was an interesting contrast to the traditional appearance of the original form and would be considerably more lightweight. The proposed scale and design would not have an adverse impact on existing amenity and privacy of neighbouring houses, and adequate private amenity and parking space was available to the household. As such officers would support the proposal, subject to conditions.

**DECISION: That the application be approved, subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with submitted plans and conditions recommended by statutory consultees.**



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/15/0595/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr R Younger  
PROPOSAL: New extensions to south east elevation & to rear elevation, new garden shed & new front canopy. New retaining wall to rear raised garden  
LOCATION: Tregurnow, Parrog Road, Newport

Planning permission was sought for a series of single storey extensions to a detached dwellinghouse, and a new garden shed, to be situated within a modest garden plot immediately fronting Parrog Road. The application had been reported to the Committee as, contrary to the officer recommendation, Newport Town Council had objected on the grounds that layout and density of the building was too large for the size of the plot, and that the shed would be in front of the building line. As these had not been available at the time of writing, it was reported at the meeting that there had been no objections from other statutory consultees or representations from members of the public.

Officers considered that the proposed extensions would not be overwhelming in mass and would respect the existing character of the main house which was relatively modern in appearance. While the garden shed was to be sited in the front garden, it was not of a scale or design harmful to the setting and would not be forward of other building lines in the area. The extensions were single storey, and there were no openings that would be considered to harm neighbouring amenity and privacy. The proposal would meet the policy requirement of the Local Development Plan and therefore the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Mr Siggins, the agent, addressed the Committee to explain that the extended dwelling would cover only 25% of the plot at most and he did not therefore think this constituted overdevelopment.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to standard conditions relating to time, accordance with plans and conditions suggested by consultees.**

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/15/0338/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mrs B Price, Quinquari Marine Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Temporary use as car park for April 1<sup>st</sup> to October 31<sup>st</sup> for 3 years (2015, 2016 & 2017)  
LOCATION: Rhosson Campsite, St Justinians

It was reported that this planning application was before the Committee due to the sensitivity of the site and issues raised in respect of the wider traffic management of St Justinians. It sought renewal of a temporary



consent for use of land at Rhosson as a car park for customers accessing boat trips from St Justinians. Earlier consent had been granted in 2006 (two years), 2008 (two years) and 2010 (three years). The 2010 consent was granted on the basis that progress would continue during that time with all partners having an interest at St Justinians to agree an alternative means of access to this area, and to eliminate the need for further similar permissions at this site.

Following consultation, nine letters of support had been received, with no objections from the City Council, Highway Authority, Common Land Officer, Natural Resources Wales or Dyfed Archaeological Trust. A letter had also been received from the RSPB and RNLi setting out their concerns over the continued unsatisfactory situation in regard to highway access, parking and visitor facilities at St Justinians, and this was read out to the Committee. A letter of objection had been received, which raised concerns in respect of the impact of the car park on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings, and the Authority's Building Conservation Officer had also recommended refusal for the same reason.

Officers acknowledged that there were established tourism businesses being carried out at St Justinians, and had considered in detail the response provided in support of the proposal, together with the fact that previous temporary permissions had been granted to allow a more sustainable means of access to St Justinians to be developed. However despite all efforts, an alternative proposal for managing traffic had not come to fruition, and the current marketing for sale of the existing RNLi slip from which the businesses operated led to uncertainty about the future operation of businesses at that location.

It was reported that the temporary car park had become a feature in what was a sensitive landscape setting as there were physical structures and signage in place, and the continuation of this use was considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade 2 and Grade 2\* listed buildings. In light of this, officers considered that there was insufficient evidence provided to support a further period of consent, and that the continued presence of the car park and its associated fencing, ticket machine and signage had a harmful effect on the setting of the listed buildings. It was therefore recommended for refusal.

The first of two speakers was Mr Christopher Taylor who introduced himself as a City Councillor and Deputy Mayor of St Davids. He spoke on behalf of the City Council in support of the application. He explained that the City Council had considered this application and the linked wider issues on a number of occasions and did not feel that granting permission in this case would have an adverse effect on the local landscape, in fact, it was set back from the coastline and in an unobtrusive location, barely



visible from the road. It was felt to work well, and the Council saw no justification for closing it. Without adequate car parking, it would be impossible for the boat owners to operate, which would devastate the economy of the area and opportunities for employment. He pointed out that many thousands of visitors came to St Davids because of the attraction of these businesses, and their loss would have an adverse impact on the tourist infrastructure. Removal of the car park would also cause traffic congestion and this would impact on the ability of RNLI staff to access the lifeboat station. With regard to arguments for the use of minibuses, the City Council considered that experience had proved that this was not a practical alternative, and did not believe there was sufficient car parking in St Davids to accommodate the cars.

The second speaker was Councillor David Lloyd who spoke on behalf of the applicant as well as the wider community which he said unanimously supported retention of the car park. He explained that he had no interest in the application, other than having lived nearby for 35 years, and circulated some photographs around the Committee, one of which showed the results of 'fly' parking along the roadside which would result if the car park was closed. The remaining pictures showed the entrance to and the car park itself. He did not believe this showed the car park to be obtrusive, but typical of the sort to be expected at this location. With regard to the adjacent listed Rhosson Farmhouse, Councillor Lloyd explained that having been a ruin for many years, it had recently been renovated and was now for sale. He went on to dispute the statement that no alternative to providing a car park had been explored by the applicant, pointing out that in addition to the Celtic Coaster a second service had been run at the applicant's expense, however it had been concluded that it was impractical to supply buses to service nine craft (fifteen in the summer) at regular intervals between 8am and 8pm. It was also considered to be unviable as in poor weather there was no need for the service to operate at all. The businesses had a big economic impact on the locality, both in terms of employment and as a visitor attraction. Having spoken for five minutes, Councillor Lloyd asked the Chairman, at her discretion, to allow him to continue, however the Chairman replied that in fairness to all other speakers she would not accede to his request.

The Committee proceeded to debate the application. Some Members were concerned about the effect on the businesses of not granting planning permission and the economic impact on the St Davids Area. Others agreed that there was no immediate likelihood of change to the entrance to the campsite, or the car park itself and that there was no impact on the landscape, however there was general support for further dialogue in order to find a long term solution. It was therefore proposed and seconded that the application be approved, with an expectation that





the National Park Authority take a leading role in finding a long term solution to the problem.

Another Member pointed out that the Authority had been involved in discussions on this matter for over ten years and that all parties needed to be willing to talk, and to set aside their own interests for the benefit of the St Davids area. Officers commented that if a car park were to be a permanent solution, a higher standard of provision would be expected. The danger of the continued granting of temporary permission leading to a permanent permission being granted was also pointed out.

Other Members agreed with the recommendation, noting that preservation of the National Park was its core purpose and this should outweigh all other matters. One member highlighted the architectural importance of Rhosson Farmhouse and its setting, and several Members felt that the existence of the car park detracted from it. It was also noted that the area currently used for car parking had gradually changed over the years from a green field to a surfaced area. The fact that other operators included transport from base to coast as part of their package was also pointed out. The recommendation of refusal was also moved and seconded.

Should planning permission be refused, Members asked whether a reasonable timescale could be given for enforcement to give time for a solution to be found, and officers agreed that a report regarding future options for enforcement could be brought to the Committee at a future meeting.

A vote was then taken on the amendment to grant permission, which was lost. The Committee then voted on the substantive motion to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the report and this was won.

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

- 1. Insufficient evidence has been submitted with the application to support the granting of further temporary permission for the car park, therefore the application does not give sufficient detail for the full consideration of the proposal. The application would, therefore, be contrary to the Local Development Plan Policies 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), 8 (Special Qualities), 15 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), 52 (Sustainable Transport) and 53 (Impacts of Traffic).**
- 2. No comprehensive traffic management scheme to accommodate the boat trippers visits to St Justinians has been submitted with the application, to enable the full consideration of the proposal. The**



application would, therefore, be contrary to the Local Development Plan Policies 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), 8 (Special Qualities), 15 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), 52 (Sustainable Transport) and 53 (Impacts of Traffic).

3. The proposal is premature in that there is no information in respect of the securing of long term launching facilities at St Justinians, which would justify a further grant of planning permission. The application would, therefore, be contrary to the Local Development Plan Policies 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), 8 (Special Qualities), 15 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), 52 (Sustainable Transport) and 53 (Impacts of Traffic).
4. The proposal would result in a detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings, and would be harmful to the special landscape character of this location in the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park. The application would, therefore, be contrary to the Local Development Plan Policies 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), 8 (Special Qualities), 15 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), together with Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
5. The application has not been supported by a landscaping scheme to mitigate the impact on the listed buildings, and on the wider landscape setting. The application would, therefore, be contrary to the Local Development Plan Policies 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), 8 (Special Qualities), 15 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), together with Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning(Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/15/0526/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr D Brown  
PROPOSAL: New Clubhouse  
LOCATION: Buttyland Caravan Park, Station Road, Manorbier

Planning permission was sought for a new clubhouse which was to replace a group of existing buildings providing on-site facilities at an established caravan and tent site at Manorbier Station.

Following consultation, the Community Council had expressed concern at the proposal in respect of the amount of development taking place on the site, the level of use the new clubhouse would generate, impact of the use on neighbouring amenity and privacy, the use of outside space and opening hours. Four letters of concern had also been received from



neighbouring properties, which had raised similar issues and these were detailed in the report.

In the supporting text to Policy 40 – Site Facilities on Tent, Chalet and Caravan Sites, it was accepted that sites would require good quality facilities, and for larger sites, these could be considered in circumstances where such facilities were lacking in the immediate locality. The caravan site fell within the Rural Centre of Manorbier Station, and currently offered a range of site facilities housed in a group of single storey buildings. The new clubhouse would be sited on the footprint of the existing buildings, and would be a two-storey structure providing a reception, lounge bar, restaurant, kitchen and storage at ground floor, with public toilets, staff facilities, office and managers accommodation at first floor.

Officers considered that the new clubhouse was acceptable in the level of facilities provided, and while the design introduced hipped roof profiles which were not a design approach common to the village, this was acceptable as it did not look ‘domestic’ in appearance, and Manorbier Station was characterised by a mix of building types and styles.

At the meeting it was reported that Natural Resources Wales had withdrawn their objection and had provided further advice to the applicant regarding the use of a cesspit for foul drainage. Also the Public Protection Division at Pembrokeshire County Council had confirmed that the site was already licenced to sell alcohol to guests and day visitors only and no complaints had been received with regard to noise.

The proposed use would be compatible with the caravan site use and setting, and would provide facilities that would be available to the Rural Centre. In light of this, the proposal would not be considered harmful to its setting, nor would harm the special qualities of the National Park. The application could be supported by officers, and the recommendation was, therefore, of delegated approval, subject to conditions including those relating to contamination, lighting and that the manager’s accommodation not be used as a separate residential unit, and subject to no objections being received from Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water and Environmental Health.

County Councillor Phil Kidney addressed the Committee, speaking on behalf of the Community Council which was not able to attend the meeting that day. The Community Council was concerned that it had received insufficient information to make a decision. It had received a letter from the applicant which called into question the integrity of Community Councillors and they were keen to ensure that due process was followed and that they reached the right decision. They therefore asked the Committee to defer the application to allow the Community Council to consider it fully.



The Director of Planning responded that officers had received a lengthy email from the Community Council and had replied to it on 18 November. At that time the Authority was itself not in receipt of all the information, and she clarified that all statutory consultees received copies of the applications and were asked for their views independently of each other. It was for the case officer to coordinate those views in order to make a recommendation to the Committee.

Some Members had sympathy with the Community Council and a motion to defer the application was moved and seconded. Others, however, supported the officer recommendation on the grounds that the application would enhance the site's facilities and this was also moved and seconded.

A vote was then taken on the motion to defer the application but this was lost. A vote on the substantive motion to delegate the application to officers to issue approval subject to conditions and to no objections being received from Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water and Environmental Health was then taken and this was won.

**DECISION: That, subject to no objections being received from Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water and Environmental Health, the application be delegated to officers to issue an approval, subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans, retention of existing boundary treatments and conditions recommended by statutory consultees, including those relating to contamination, lighting and that the manager's accommodation not be provided as a separate residential unit.**

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/15/15/0571/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr E Lambert  
PROPOSAL: Extension & alterations including conversion of garage to granny flat & restoration of cottage front, also replacement of shed with new stable block  
LOCATION: Pengawse Isaf, Mountain West, Newport

It was reported that the property sat within a small cluster of dwellings in an elevated position in Mountain West. The cottage was of traditional construction. The proposed scheme sought to attach the single storey garage to the north of the property, raise the roof and convert it into a 'granny annexe', construct a stable building to the north east of the dwelling and extend the dwelling at the rear with a two storey extension.



The application was before the Committee as Newport Town Council had recommended refusal as the layout and density of the building were too large for the size of the plot and although happy with the house proposal were dubious about the scale of the stable block. This recommendation was contrary to that of officers who considered the proposed extensions to be sympathetic and in keeping with the character of the original cottage and in accordance with Local Development Plan Policies. The recommendation was therefore one of approval.

The applicant, Mr Lambert, then addressed the Committee. He pointed out that the proposal did not extend the line of the extension beyond the existing footprint. The roof height would also only be increased over the extended element of the dwelling. He added that they believed the garage was originally a stone barn that had been attached to the house in the past and this application would attach it to the house once more. With regard to the stable block, Mr Lambert informed the Committee that the house had 4 acres of land and his wife was keen to have some equestrian facilities, and this would also double as outside storage. He noted that the ecologist had suggested a lot of conservation work to accommodate bats and the proposals helped to justify the cost of that.

The officer clarified that the report had not intended to suggest an increase in the footprint of the dwelling, only in its proposed roofline.

Members supported the application, and particularly the work to restore the façade. With regard to the comment in the report that the Town Council had changed its mind, following an identical application earlier in the year, another Member pointed out that this Committee had been known to change its mind and this was part of the democratic process.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans, the annexe to be occupied only for purposes ancillary to the dwelling, private stabling incidental to the use of the dwelling, adequate facilities for parking and turning, external materials and finishes, lighting and no approval for any demolition or rebuilding of the existing garage.**

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/15/0597/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Rees  
PROPOSAL: Edwardian style porch to front of property  
LOCATION: Yr Hafan, Fishguard

Planning permission was sought for the erection of a single storey white UPVC Edwardian style porch to the front elevation of the 1930's dormer bungalow. While there was no objection in principle to the provision of a porch, officers considered that the proposal in its current form appeared



as a modern 'free standing' structure that failed to integrate with the host dwelling and had an adverse effect on its character. Although a similar structure existed to the side of the property, the provision of a porch with its proposed Edwardian roof style design to the principal elevation was considered harmful to the host property. As such the proposal in its current form could not be supported and it was recommended for refusal by reason of its siting and design. The application was before the Committee as this was contrary to the recommendation of the Community Council.

The officer clarified that the proposed porch exceeded the ground area for permitted development and therefore required planning permission. Officers had contacted the agent to express their concern over the design of the porch, however no alternative design had been forthcoming.

One Member expressed support for application, on the basis that the property was in an exposed location and this was a small addition to a property that had no outstanding visual merit, however others considered the proposed design to be incongruous and efforts should be made to improve it. Another Member questioned whether the property would be covered by the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to pre-1940s buildings and therefore whether the porch should be in wood.

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

- 1. The proposed porch, by reason of its siting and design on the principal elevation of the host dwelling in a prominent location, would be visually intrusive contrary to criterion (a) of Policy 15 and criterion (d) of Policy 30 of the LDP. It would also be out of keeping with the host dwelling and surrounding area contrary to criterion (b) of Policy 15 and criterion (a) of Policy 29 and would fail to protect the special qualities of the National Park. Policy 8 of the LDP refers to the special qualities of the National Park with poor design being discouraged by criterion (b). Criterion (a) of Policy 15 and criterion (d) of Policy 30 seek to resist development that would cause significant visual intrusion and criterion (a) of Policy 29 seeks to encourage development that is well designed in terms of place and local distinctiveness. Insensitively and unsympathetically sited development is resisted by criterion (b) of Policy 15.**

## **8. Appeals**

The Director of Planning reported on 5 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.



One appeal decision was attached to the report relating to The Oaks, Land adj to Wynd Hill Farm, Manorbier which had been dismissed.

**NOTED.**

**9. Christmas Greetings**

The Chairman concluded the meeting by wishing everyone 'Nadolig Llawen' – a Happy Christmas.

