

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

27 January 2016

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)

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

[Mrs M Thomas arrived during consideration of the first application NP/15/0310]

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 10.40am]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor ML Evans, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor R Kilmister and Councillor D Rees.

2. Disclosures of interest

There were no disclosures of interest.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 16 December 2015 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 16 December 2015 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/15/0310 <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Eco-smallholding, including one dwelling – One Planet Development – Land adjacent to Castle Hill, Newport	Mr William Ward, Objector Ms Sue Gillooley, Applicant



5. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report, which was presented by the Monitoring Officer in the Solicitor's absence, 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

6. Report of Planning Applications

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Head of Development Management, together with any updates reported verbally on the day and recorded below. The Committee determined the applications as follows (*the decision reached on each follows the details of the relevant application*):

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/15/0310/FUL
APPLICANT: Ms S Gillooley
PROPOSAL: Eco-smallholding, including one dwelling – One Planet Development
LOCATION: Land adjacent to Castle Hill, Newport

Planning permission was sought for an eco-smallholding, submitted under the 'One Planet Development' (OPD) Welsh government policy, the principles of which officers outlined for the Committee. It was reported that the application site comprised 2.6 hectares of land located on the south eastern outskirts of Newport, and just below Carningli Mountain. The eco-smallholding would comprise a new dwelling, greenhouse, barn and associated trackways and parking. The application was reported to the Committee as it was considered to be a "major development", as the site covered more than 1 hectare.

Dyfed Archaeological Trust had raised concerns, recommending that a historic environment appraisal be carried out prior to making a decision, however officers, having taken account of the response, considered that as the built element of the scheme was confined to a small section of the site, and the Management Plan had identified the site characteristics in its Baseline Assessment, it would be acceptable to address this matter by condition.



Newport Town Council had objected on the grounds that there had been no community consultation, that traffic issues could occur if visitor numbers/helpers were significant and concerns in respect of the exit strategy and demise/incapacity of an applicant. Letters of objection had also be received which, in summary, objected to issues of the impact on the landscape, the unsuitability of the land for such a proposal and that the Management Plan was not robust.

It was reported at the meeting that since writing the Committee report, two further public responses had been received – one of support and one expressing concern. Also further information had been received from the applicant confirming the figures given regarding livestock prices which would mean that the applicant would meet her own basic needs from income derived solely from the site. Officers also noted that the yearly Monitoring Plan would monitor income to ensure that the OPD was proceeding as planned. With regard to the query raised at consultation concerning the cost associated with sending fleeces away to be processed , the applicant had stated that these could be processed in Newcastle Emlyn which would cost less. Finally, some costs for vets bills had already been allowed for in the Management Plan and the applicant intended to administer some treatments herself.

Officers considered that the nature of the OPD proposed was broadly akin to an agricultural small-holding, albeit subject to more stringent planning policies with occupancy requirements. The applicant had adequately addressed the requirements of national planning policy by providing a detailed Management Plan, and while concern had been expressed as to whether the applicant would be able to fulfil this Plan at this location, OPD requirements built in yearly monitoring, with an Exit Strategy agreed by the applicant should the OPD not be successful. In light of this, it was considered that the proposal could be supported and the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions set out in the report.

The first speaker was Mr William Ward, who explained that he had lived and gardened at Castle Hill for 30 years. He stated that neighbouring properties had not been consulted about the application or regarding access along the lane. Mr Ward did not consider that the Committee report adequately dealt with the detailed responses that had been submitted. He said that the site was in a beautiful position within the National Park on Carningli Mountain, and that the fields had only ever been used for grazing. Policy 8 of the Local Development Plan was intended to protect such sites to ensure that the sense of remoteness and tranquillity was not lost and consideration also needed to be given to protection of the adjacent SSSI. He added that the Technical Advice Note (TAN) said that not all sites were suitable for OPD and he considered this site fell into that category. He stated that the applicant had failed to grow



vegetables on the site, having no claimed expertise in horticulture, even though the Management Plan was to be supported by robust evidence of a competent person, and that the land was grade 4 'disadvantaged' land with acidic soil, and therefore not suited to growing lavender which liked an alkaline soil. Mr Ward considered that the OPD development drove a coach and horses through the normal planning rules, and that the Management Plan was a wish list that could not comply with TAN 6 and should be rejected. He questioned why the car park was being extended, when the use of a private car was contrary to OPD, and said that the excavations that had taken place had caused flooding in the lanes and on his land. He believed the applicant had chosen the highest, most difficult place to cultivate, which was a long way from any public transport. Mr Ward suggested that a OPD would not normally be located on grade 4 land and that the applicant might only be interested in building a house at this location. He believed that the application was so flawed, it should be turned down, however he asked that in any case the house be not allowed until the horticultural element had been implemented. He was also concerned as a second OPD application had already been lodged for development of a neighbouring site.

The applicant, Sue Gillooley, then addressed the Committee. Responding to some of the queries raised, she noted that officers had provided the Committee with information about the spinning of wool and vets bills. With regard to the lavender, trials had shown that the soil could be improved through the addition of lime and with good drainage, and that the plants had prospered in both 2014 and 2015. The pasture too had been improved by grazing. A tree survey had suggested that, with careful management, coppicing could succeed. The house location had been carefully chosen to cause the least visual impact and would be sunk down 2m below ground at certain points to ensure in blended into the landscape. It would be made of natural materials in an earthy colour to minimise its visibility, and was of a modest floor area but would provide a comfortable and cosy space. She considered that more needed to be done to educate the public about OPD, given the comments made by Newport Town Council, and she had written to the Chair explaining that she was happy to organise a presentation and open forum for the benefit of councillors, local residents and other interested parties; she understood that people would have worries, and she wished to dispel their concerns. Ms Gilloolie said that she was passionate about a 'back to basics' philosophy and was equipped with the skills to fully commit to the project and to benefit the wider community. She added that Cadw had endorsed what she was trying to achieve, and she was seeking planning permission to enable her to live simply and modestly and to tend the land.

Considering that the site was in a stunning location which had to be seen to be fully appreciated, a site visit was moved and seconded. This would allow Members to view the access to the site, which was thought to be



challenging and to assess the visibility of OPD at this location in relation to the rest of Carningli Mountain.

Other Members asked that clarification be provided regarding the status of Policy 47 (Low Impact Development) of the Authority's Local Development Plan (LDP), as the application had been assessed against TAN 6. The officer explained that as TAN 6 had been published since the Authority's LDP it carried greater weight and Planning Policy Wales therefore advised that consideration of the application should be taken against the most up to date policy position ie TAN 6. This point would be addressed further in the officer's next report to the Committee. Members also asked to be provided with details of the Management Plan and the advice of the agricultural advisor.

DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow the site to be inspected by the Committee.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/15/0637/FUL
APPLICANT: Ms D Jenkins
PROPOSAL: Alterations & extension to existing dwelling
LOCATION: Kiln House, Porthgain, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this application was brought before the Committee as Llanrhian Community Council had objected to the scheme on the basis of overdevelopment and Policy 30 – Amenity.

The proposed alterations were intended to raise the height of the roof from 6.2m to ridge to 7.5m, with a steeper more traditional pitch to provide additional head room in the first floor bedrooms, a gabled first floor roof extension to the rear of the dwelling with dormer window, a wider lean-to to the western elevation with larger window and a new porch over the kitchen door on the eastern elevation. There was also proposed a change in levels within the garden to provide a car parking area.

There had been a significant amount of pre-application advice given in respect of amending the proposals prior to submission, and the proposed alterations were now considered to be acceptable in terms of visual and residential amenity, constituted an improvement in materials and design and were in accordance with National Park policies. The officer apologised that the recommendation of approval, together with the proposed conditions, had not been included with the original Committee report, but had been sent out separately prior to the meeting.

One Member began by commenting that the existing dwelling was prominent in what was a sensitive landscape, however it was agreed that removal of the dormer window and replacement slate roof would improve the current situation. Members asked that conditions be added regarding



lighting and to require levels to be agreed for and landscaping of the parking area.

DECISION: that the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans, samples of materials to be provided, lighting, levels and landscaping.

7. Appeals

The Director of Planning 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.

Two appeals were reported to the Committee, relating to a variation of condition to allow the sale of hot take-away food until 21.30 at Café Aromas, Trafalgar Road, Tenby, and Erection of dwelling and change of use of land at Mead Meadow, The Ridgeway, Manorbier. Both appeals were dismissed.

NOTED.

8. Report on Other Planning Issues – NP/15/0252/S73 – Variation of condition 7 of NP/55/95 in order to allow annex to be occupied as residential unit – Bro Helyg, Dinas Cross

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the Development Management Committee in September 2015, when they had been minded to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendation. It had therefore been subject to the Authority's 'Cooling Off' procedure. In the interim, officers had undertaken a rough assessment of viability without the assistance of the applicant which demonstrated that it would not be viable to ask for an affordable housing contribution. The application had therefore been approved under the Authority's delegation scheme subject to conditions but with no affordable housing contribution requirement.

NOTED.

