

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

8 November 2017

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

Mr A Archer, Mrs D Clements, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor M Evans, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor P Harries, Mrs G Hayward, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor PJ Morgan, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 1.15pm]

1. Following the reporting of the recent tragic death of Carl Sergeant AM, the Committee stood for a minute's silence.
2. **Apology**  
An apology for absence was received from Councillor P Baker.
3. **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(a) and 7(b) below</i> NP/16/0677 and NP/16/0679 - Blackpool Mill, Blackpool Bridge, Narberth	Councillor A Wilcox Councillor P Harries	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minutes 7(d)below</i> NP/17/0301 – Newport Pottery and former Depot Site, Parrog Road, Newport	Councillor P Harries	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minutes 7(g)below</i> NP/17/0346 Land at Lawrenny	Councillor D Clements	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
	Mr AE Sangster	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the



discussion thereon.

*Minutes 7(h)below*  
NP/17/0452 6 St Brides  
View, Solva

Councillor M Evans

Withdrew from the  
meeting while the  
application was  
discussed

#### 4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 20 September 2017 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 20 September 2017 be confirmed and signed.

**NOTED.**

#### 5. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 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/16/0677/FUL <i>Minute 7(a)</i> <i>refers</i>	Conversion & restoration of existing Mill and ancillary buildings to provide heritage tourist facility. Construction of light narrow gauge steam railway with associated station & platform. Construction of 792sq.m all-weather events barn & associated facilities, cycle parking, car parking, site infrastructure including drainage services along with hard and soft landscaping & boundary treatments – Blackpool Mill, Blackpool Bridge, Narberth	Valerie Bradley – Objector Robin Williams - Agent
NP/16/0679/FUL <i>Minute 7(b)</i>	Engineering works to facilitate the land train route	Joseph Sutherland – Objector



<i>refers</i>	from main resort centre, due north, to link with newly refurbished & extended car park to serve the Blackpool Mill proposal - Blackpool Mill, Blackpool Bridge, Narberth	Robin Williams – Agent
NP/17/0305/FUL <i>Minute 7(e)</i> <i>refers</i>	Conversion of existing boathouse to annex with construction of new basement & covered stairway, construction of new recreation room to the southern side of the bungalow & relocation of existing external shower, removal of existing bay windows & replacement with windows – Trewent Bungalow, Freshwater East	Vicky Tomlinson – Objector
NP/17/0315/FUL <i>Minute 7(f)</i> <i>Refers</i>	Residential development comprising 18 dwellings with associated works – Land off Walton Road, Broad Haven	Ramone Phillips – Community Council Connie Stephens – Objector Robin Williams – Agent
NP/17/0452/FUL <i>Minute 7(h)</i> <i>Refers</i>	Demolish and rebuild curtilage & roadside wall and creation of a parking space on vacant land immediately north of Pentwyn – Pentwyn, 6 St Brides View, Solva	Ashley Heart – Objector Ian Bartlett – Agent
NP/17/0548/FUL <i>Minutes 7(j)</i> <i>Refers</i>	Extension of cattle shed for beef herd & associated deposit of excavated material – Land north of Hean Castle, Saundersfoot	David Lewis – 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. The duty of the Authority carry out sustainable development in accordance with the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and the Planning (Wales) Act 2017 Part 2 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

## 7. 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*):

*[Councillors P Harries and A Wilcox disclosed an interest in the following two applications and withdrew from the meeting while they were considered.]*

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/16/0677/FUL  
APPLICANT: Bluestone National Park Resorts Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Conversion & restoration of existing Mill and ancillary buildings to provide heritage tourist facility. Construction of light narrow gauge steam railway with associated station & platform. Construction of 792sq.m all-weather events barn & associated facilities, cycle parking, car parking, site infrastructure including drainage services along with hard and soft landscaping & boundary treatments  
LOCATION: Blackpool Mill, Blackpool Bridge, Narberth, Pembrokeshire, SA67 9BL

Members were reminded that this 'Major' application had been brought to the Committee in May 2017, following a Site Inspection by Members in February 2017, when its consideration was deferred at the request of the



applicant in order to allow them to seek to address the recommended reasons for refusal.

Since May 2017, meetings had taken place between the applicant, applicant's agents and the Authority in order to discuss potential alterations to the scheme and additional information required. However, to date no further information or amended plans had been submitted.

The report provided details of the proposed development, as well as public and statutory consultee responses received. It was noted that a 128 signature petition objecting to the development had also been received. The officer's appraisal concluded that the proposed development would, by virtue of its scale, design and location, result in a harmful impact on the Special Qualities of the National Park, particularly with regard to the adverse impact on tranquillity and the sense of remoteness of the application site and surrounding area. The proposed development would also have a harmful impact on the setting of the Grade II\* listed Mill building and ancillary buildings and the setting of the Grade II listed High Toch farmhouse, with particular regard to the proposed railway, platform, station, fencing and events barn. It was also considered that the application was lacking sufficient information in order to allow the local planning authority to properly assess the impact of the development on protected species and nearby designated sites, and a traffic monitoring scheme and highway improvement details which would provide the local planning authority with sufficient confidence that the development would not result in a detrimental impact to highway and pedestrian safety.

Whilst, it was acknowledged that the development would result in an economic benefit to the area and would restore a Grade II\* listed building, the harmful impacts of the development on the special qualities of the National Park and the setting of the listed buildings were not outweighed by the economic factors. The "Sandford Principle" clearly stated that "Where irreconcilable conflicts exist between conservation and public enjoyment, then, conservation interest should take priority", as such, the application as proposed could not be supported and it was recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the report. Officers also noted that if the application were refused by the Committee, the applicant would have an opportunity to resubmit within 12 months without having to pay a fee. Members were also reassured that discussions would continue regarding a more suitable enabling development. It was also considered the wider proposal could be made more sustainable by re-locating the car parking provision to within or adjacent to the Bluestone resort, removing the potentially significant impacts to the minor road adjoining Blackpool Mill.



The Chair drew the Committee's attention to a letter of concern from the Friends of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The first of two speakers was Valerie Bradley who explained that she had lived near the site for 50 years and had always enjoyed it as a picturesque, tranquil oasis. She said that she agreed with the objections of Llawhaden Community Council and the Planning Ecologist as set out in the report. Ms Bradley considered the chain link fence to be of a forbidding nature when the ethos of the National Park was to conserve, enhance and share. Most visitors to the area were currently local and she therefore described the proposal as "theft". The site was of nature conservation and geological value and the development was not of a sustainable design, did not protect biodiversity and would cause light pollution. The peaceful nature of the lane, which was well used by walkers, would be destroyed. Ms Bradley believed the proposals would not be an amenity, but a cheap eyesore, with the proposed prefabricated barn being larger in footprint than the Mill, and the calendar of events that was provided she considered to be a ghastly wish list. She also considered that a sewerage management plan was needed given the number of visitors expected at the site. This was a poor imitation of established venues and she expected it to have a brief lifespan; more attractions of this sort were not needed. The jobs that would be provided would be low paid and seasonal with poor prospects, with the only beneficiaries being the applicants.

Ms Bradley felt that Blackpool Mill, which had been designed to complement the wider estate buildings, had become a target, with the resident otters, ospreys and starlings having no voice. She agreed that the sense of tranquillity at this location was very important and quoted from the definition as set out in the report. While the building was closed, it was not unloved and she implored the Committee to refuse the application.

The Agent, Robin Williams, responded by stating that he did not intend to debate the merits of the proposal, but simply asked for deferral of the application to allow submission of a revised scheme, with material changes, for consideration. He explained that since May, the applicants had engaged with officers, both at the Authority and Pembrokeshire County Council's Highways Officer and Ecologist and significant progress had been made. Officers were aware that the applicant had been working to a mid-November deadline for resubmission due to the ecology season having just ended and the timing of a report by the special advisor with regard to tranquillity. The agent therefore said that he had been surprised that the application had been reported to this Committee, especially as he was confident that the reasons for refusal would be addressed by the



resubmission. Mr Williams also pointed out that since the application had been deferred in May there had been a change in Committee Membership and he had therefore expected a further site visit to have taken place for consistency and questioned how Members could determine the application without having visited the site. He therefore asked Members to defer the application which would allow them to visit the site as well as for submission of the necessary information by the applicant.

Members asked the agent about the scale of the changes to the application, and he replied that there would be ecological enhancement following the additional survey work, changes to car parking as well as other amendments. Officers added that if there were material changes made to the scheme this would require additional consultation. They considered that it would be a more transparent process for all involved if the application was refused and resubmitted.

Several Members stated that they were minded to defer the application to allow the additional information to be submitted. One expressed disappointment that there had not been greater cooperation between officers and the applicant and felt that bringing the application before the Committee that day had 'jumped the gun' as Members did not have all the necessary information before them and this was prejudicial to the applicant. He stated that it was more important to get the right decision than for due process to be followed, and moved that the application be deferred. This was seconded.

Several Members disagreed that due process was not important, and welcomed the officer's approach of openness and transparency. They believed there were so many outstanding issues that it would be better to refuse the application so that a fresh application could be submitted and Members could then visit the site. This amendment was also proposed and seconded. Another Member asked that, should the application be refused, mention should be made of Section 66 which gave special regard to listed buildings and their setting as this had to be given an important weight.

A vote was then taken on deferral of the application and this was lost. The Committee then voted on the motion to refuse the application and this was won.

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

- 1. The proposed development by virtue of its scale, design and location would result in a detrimental visual impact on the locality and harm to the special qualities of the National Park. The proposed development will result in a significant loss to the sense of**



remoteness and tranquillity of the area and will be insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape and will introduce a development not compatible with its location and is therefore contrary to Policies 1 (National Park Purpose and Duties), 8 (Special Qualities), 15(Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) of the adopted Local Development Plan (2010) and Planning Policy Wales (Edition 9) 2016.

2. The proposed development by virtue of its scale, design and location would result in a harmful impact to the setting of the Grade II\* listed Mill building and ancillary buildings and the Grade II listed High Toch farmhouse to the detriment of the historic environment of the locality and to the special qualities of the National Park. The development is therefore contrary to Policies 1 (National Park Purpose and Duties), 8 (Special Qualities), 15(Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) of the adopted Local Development Plan (2010).
3. Insufficient details have been submitted in respect of the impact of the development on protected species and designated sites to allow the local planning authority to properly evaluated the impact of the development and carry out a Habitats Regulations Assessment, which is contrary to Policy 11 of the adopted Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (2010) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).
4. Insufficient information has been submitted in respect of the control of vehicle movements, parking monitoring and highway improvements in the form of a legal agreement to allow the local planning authority to properly evaluate the impact of the development on highway and pedestrian safety. The application is therefore contrary to Policy 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park adopted Local Development Plan (2010).

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/16/0679/FUL  
APPLICANT: Bluestone National Park Resorts Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Engineering works to facilitate the land train route from main resort centre, due north, to link with newly refurbished & extended car park to serve the Blackpool Mill proposal  
LOCATION: Blackpool Mill, Blackpool Bridge, Narberth, Pembrokeshire, SA67 8BL

Members were reminded that this application was reported to the Committee for consideration because it raised matters of significant public





interest and was part of the overall development of Blackpool Mill and surrounding land (*Minute 7(a) refers*). Members had walked the route of the land train when visiting the site in February 2017. The application had then been brought to the Committee in May 2017 when its consideration was deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow them to seek to address the recommended reasons for refusal.

Since May 2017, meetings had taken place between the applicant, applicant's agents and the Authority in order to discuss potential alterations to the scheme and additional information required. However, to date no further information or amended plans had been submitted.

Officers considered that the principle of the land train proposal was broadly acceptable. However, the level of detail provided to date had been insufficient to ensure that there would be no harm to protected species, trees and landscape thus the application was recommended for refusal.

The application was intrinsically linked with the overall development of the Mill and surrounding land and in order to ensure that the land train operated as proposed and minimised the impact on the existing highway network by being brought forward in advance of the overall development, a S106 agreement would be required. A S106 had not been submitted with the application and given the significant impact the overall development could have on highway and vulnerable users' safety without the security of the land train operation it is considered that the development would result in a detrimental impact on highway safety.

The first of two speakers was Joseph Sutherland. He believed that there was evidence that Bluestone was already impacting biodiversity, especially in the meadow, however further survey work was required particularly entomological and nocturnal surveys, which had currently not been undertaken. He was also concerned that the non-native surface would interrupt the passage of wildlife and that the only means of surface water drainage was via soakaways, and given the potential for oil pollution from vehicles, he suggested that a sealed drainage system, together with an oil pollution plan might be more appropriate, particularly due to the proximity of the watercourse. His other concern related to lighting as this would negatively affect the bats; Mr Sutherland questioned why lighting was needed along the route of the land train as the vehicle pulling the train would have its own lights, and he surmised that the track would also be used as a cycleway. He was also concerned that the land train would be unregulated and unlicensed as it operated solely on private land. With regard to the railway, Mr Sutherland stated that there was no evidence of there being any Light Railway Orders having been made in the vicinity of Blackpool Mill. He concluded by saying that the proposals as presented



did not fall within the National Park's objectives of positive environmental gain and protection.

The agent, Robin Williams, declined his opportunity to speak again saying that he had no further comment to add to those made on the previous application.

Although the report indicated that the principle of the development was broadly acceptable, the lack of a S106 Agreement, ecological and tree surveys led Members to vote that the application be refused.

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

- 1. Insufficient information has been submitted in respect of survey work already undertaken, the impacts on nearby SSSI's and SAC's, and the potential wildlife impacts on trees impacted by the route. The application cannot therefore be supported and fails to comply with Policies 11 (Protection of biodiversity) and 15(Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (2010).**
- 2. Insufficient information has been submitted in respect of a survey of trees which will be impacted by the proposed foundations of the trackway. At 4.6 metres width with a depth of 1 metres, tree roots may be negatively impacted by the proposed engineering works, the Local Planning Authority are unable to properly assess the impact on the trees without this information. Based on the potential harm to a number of mature trees along the route, the application cannot be supported and fails to comply with Policies 8 (Special Qualities), 11 (Protection of biodiversity) and 15(Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (2010).**
- 3. In the absence of any S106 agreement the development will result in a detrimental impact on highway safety. The land train must be delivered prior to the beneficial use of the Blackpool Mill attraction proposed under NP/16/0677/FUL. The application does not propose any mechanism to ensure this is achieved; therefore the proposed development is contrary to Policies 52 & 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (2010).**

*The Committee adjourned briefly.*



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/17/0299/FUL  
APPLICANT: CTIL & Telefonica  
PROPOSAL: Installation of a 15m column mast accommodating internal antennas, 2 no 300mm dishes, radio equipment housing and ancillary development within a fenced compound, together with access way  
LOCATION: North of Greenlea, Dinas Cross, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0XD

This application was reported to the Committee as the views of the Community Council were contrary to the officer recommendation of approval.

The application site was located in a small copse of trees within the centre of Dinas Cross adjacent to the playing field. The proposed scheme was part of a project to identify and provide coverage to rural areas and or villages where coverage black spots or not-spots existed. Dinas Cross and its surrounding areas had been identified as one such area, and the proposal would provide a significant improvement in coverage to the village and surrounding roads and areas.

Six letters of objection had been received from neighbouring properties in addition to the objection from Dinas Cross Community Council, and the matters raised were set out in the report.

Officers considered that the proposed scheme had a scale, mass, form and detailed design which was acceptable in this instance. The design appearance and location of the base station would ensure that the special qualities of the National Park were maintained when viewed from the immediate and wider landscape. The proposal would also ensure that the existing signal coverage for the Dinas Cross area would be improved in line with other areas within Wales. As such the proposal was considered to be acceptable and could be supported subject to appropriate conditions.

The officer clarified at the meeting that the response from PCNPA Park Direction – Minerals should have read “No objection”, while the response of the Access and Rights of Way Manger had been omitted and this was “No objections subject to conditions which should be contained in an informative if planning permission is granted.” He also advised that, at the request of Dyfed Archaeological Trust, Cadw had been consulted due to the proximity of standing stones, however they had no objection to the proposals. Additional information had also been received from the agent to address condition 4 as set out in the report, and the officer therefore requested that condition 4 be omitted from any consent granted.



Members acknowledged that one of the problems of living in Pembrokeshire was the lack of coverage for broadband and mobile networks, and therefore a balance had to be struck between addressing that need and its effect on the landscape. They believed that officers had come to the correct conclusion in respect of this application.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans and drainage together with Informatives, as set out in the report.**

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

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/17/0301/FUL  
APPLICANT: M & G Smith & Thomas, Projects Plus Ltd & Tai Wales & West Housing  
PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of former pottery & depot site to include conversion of pottery building; part demolition of pottery outbuilding & full demolition of redundant depot buildings, for development of 8 affordable housing units & 4 open market housing units. The application is also to include infrastructure, landscaping improvements, biodiversity mitigation & enhancements and any ancillary works  
LOCATION: Newport Pottery & former Depot Site, Parrog Road, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0RG

The application was reported to the Committee as it was classed as major development.

The site lay within the local centre boundary, and therefore the principle of the proposal for residential development was considered to be acceptable. Officers considered that the density of the site was appropriate for this area and that the proposal was acceptable in terms of visual amenity and retained the special qualities of the National Park and also the character and identity of the local centre of Newport. The site was adjacent to a listed building, Trem y Don, however the proposed development was considered to preserve its setting.

It was reported that the site had two landowners, Newport Town Council and a private landowner. These two had combined to agree the sale of a plot of land to Tai Wales and West Housing, a Registered Social Landlord (RSL), to develop the affordable housing element of the proposal. Without this combined approach, it was understood that the RSL would not be able to develop the former Depot site alone, which it was understood had a restrictive covenant that would prevent market housing



development. This combined approach resulted in 8 out of 12 residential units being affordable when considering the scheme as a whole. The delivery of affordable units on site would be secured via a S106 legal agreement. A further S106 legal agreement would secure a financial contribution for education from the four full market dwellings.

A letter had been received from a neighbour at Trem-y-don which raised a privacy concern. Officers considered that as the windows to be provided were high level and roof windows they would not have any adverse impact on the amenity or privacy of the neighbour.

In conclusion, officers considered that, following consideration of local and national policies and all material considerations, the development would provide new residential properties while sustaining the local character, and would not impact on privacy or amenity of neighbours. As such, and subject to S106 Agreements and a schedule of suitable conditions, the development was considered to be acceptable. It was recommended that it be delegated to officers to grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined within the report and completion of S106 Agreements in respect of the provision of affordable housing and planning obligations within 3 months of the meeting.

Members agreed that this was an excellent application which provided affordable housing in an area where it was needed, as well as developing a vacant site, and they commended Newport Town Council for its work in taking this proposal forward as well as the involvement of the new Housing Association Tai Wales and West Housing.

Questions were asked regarding lighting and the visibility of the site and retention of the façade of the building and stone wall, and officers replied that the pottery building would be largely retained with only a small amount of demolition to the rear and there would be only limited visibility of the site from within the settlement. As the development was located within an urban area, there would be street lighting, and a lighting plan had been provided. Members also wanted to ensure there was adequate parking for the site and officers explained that most properties would be provided with two parking spaces. However, a new footpath would be provided along what was a narrow road through realignment of the boundary wall and the site was located close to the centre of Newport which had good access to public transport.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/ Director of Planning/ Team Leader to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as outlined within the report and completion of S106 Agreements in respect of the provision of affordable housing and planning obligations within 3 months of the**



**meeting. If not received within this time, officers were authorised to consider refusal of the application on lack of affordable housing and planning obligations being provided. Conditions related to timing, accordance with plans, tree protection, ecology, drainage and provision of a sample of stonework.**

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/17/0305/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Bell  
PROPOSAL: Conversion of existing boathouse to annex with construction of new basement & covered stairway, construction of new recreation room to the southern side of the bungalow & relocation of existing external shower, removal of existing bay windows & replacement with windows  
LOCATION: Trewent Bungalow, Freshwater East, Pembroke, Pembrokeshire, SA71 5LN

This application was brought to the Committee as the views of the Community Council were contrary to those of officers.

It was reported that the dwelling was located immediately above Freshwater East beach, to the eastern edge of a raised landscape of sand dunes and was visible from both the village and the beach. However, officers considered that the curtilage of the property was capable of accommodating the new development without appearing out of scale and overdeveloped. The replacement windows were more modern in appearance but were considered to be a visual improvement on the original design. At the meeting, the officer confirmed that amended plans had been received for relocation of the swimming pool. A landscaping condition was recommended to require submission of a detailed landscaping scheme to ensure that species and finishes were appropriate to the coastal edge. A lighting condition to require full details of any external lighting was also recommended.

The concerns of Lamphey Community Council, also reiterated by neighbours, were addressed in the report. Officers agreed that it was important to ensure that the dwelling did not become 'two-storey' in profile through a steady change in levels. However, while the proposed scheme allowed for better light to the basement bedrooms, it did not involve the wholesale lowering of the garden level between the house and the beach slope. It was therefore considered that from the most important views via the beach, the property would still appear as a bungalow with basement, rather than as a two storey property and that levels could be adequately controlled by planning condition to ensure that the overall development was appropriate to the setting.



In conclusion, officers considered that the proposal would be an acceptable form of development which was compatible with the existing setting and use of the site. Sufficient private parking and amenity space was available to the property. As such they considered that the proposal could be supported and the recommendation was of approval, subject to amended plans and conditions.

There was one speaker, Vicky Tomlinson, who lived in Freshwater East and wished to assist the Authority in its role of conserving the natural beauty of the bay. She had three areas of concern. Firstly that the application contained insufficient information to allow the committee to make a decision; that the report did not highlight the sensitivity of the area; and finally that if granted, the decision would set an unfortunate precedent for other properties in the village. Mrs Tomlinson read out a sheet of comments which she also handed out to Members, together with some photographs, which set out her concerns in relation to each of the headings in the officers' report.

Members were concerned on a number of points: the potential commercial use of the property together with possible noise disturbance and light pollution, the 'failure to clear mess left on beach' highlighted by Mrs Tomlinson, and potential impact on the adjacent SSSI. Officers replied that a condition in respect of lighting was recommended, however, as the application was for extensions to a domestic dwelling, further conditions regarding use and noise were not possible. Natural Resources Wales had not expressed any concern regarding the adjacent SSSI, however conditions 3 and 4 could be amended to require the Construction Method Statement to be implemented as agreed and to require details of hard and soft landscaping to be submitted prior to any further development commencing on site which would hopefully allay Members' concerns. Members asked officers to ensure the conditions were complied with due to the sensitivity of the site.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, Construction Method Statement, landscaping, lighting, parking and removal of permitted development rights.**



- (f) REFERENCE: NP/17/0315/FUL  
APPLICANT: Waterstone Homes  
PROPOSAL: Residential development comprising 18 dwellings with associated works  
LOCATION: Land off Walton road, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3LX

It was reported that this application, which was classed as major development, sought full planning permission for the construction of 18 dwellings – four detached 4-bed market dwellings, eight semi-detached 4-bed market dwellings and six affordable houses provided as one-bed apartments in a single block. The site was allocated in the Local Development Plan for 8 residential units and in 2014 outline planning permission had been granted with all matters reserved (subject to legal agreements) for the development of ten dwellings – six full market dwellings and four affordable housing apartments in a single block.

It was reported at the meeting that PCC Drainage Engineers supported the application but noted that infiltration methods of drainage would not work on the sloping site and had therefore requested a condition to ensure that surface water was dealt with appropriately. Three further letters had been received from the general public and two from the neighbouring Church which was concerned about water from soakaways running into the graveyard.

With regard to highway issues, there had been objections to the development on the grounds of increased traffic and lack of footpaths to link to the village. The Highway Authority had recommended conditional consent, but advised that a planning contribution of £20,000 was required for the design and provision of additional footway links to the village from the development site. However, officers considered that if the Authority was to accept an increase in density on this site, then safe pedestrian links to the village should be included as part of the application in order to ensure that a suitable footpath link could be delivered. Discussions regarding such a route were ongoing, with the applicants willing to discuss the provision of such a route within the site.

Following consideration of the policies within the Local Development Plan, officers considered that the principle of development of this site for housing purposes was acceptable. The increase in density was not considered harmful to the setting, and, subject to the provision of amended plans detailing the inclusion of a pedestrian route within the current scheme, or if this could not be achieved, a legal agreement to secure a contribution toward a safe pedestrian route, the proposal could be supported subject to conditions including an additional condition





regarding surface water drainage. It was also noted that Condition 4 in the report should refer to a Full, rather than Reserved Matters application.

It was therefore recommended that the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/ Director of Planning/ Team Leader to grant planning permission subject to the interested persons(s) first entering into a satisfactory Section 106 Legal Agreement(s) relating to the provision of affordable housing units and planning contributions towards highways, play equipment and community facilities. Should amended plans be received for the provision of a footpath link, then the highways contribution would be suitably amended or removed from the legal agreement accordingly. Any planning permission would also be subject to the conditions as set out the report and detailed at the meeting.

The first of three speakers on this application was Ramone Phillips from the Havens Community Council, who began by inviting the Committee to visit the site. She explained that it was located on a single-track road with few passing places and also on a steep gradient. The road was busy and used by buses which often led to tailbacks for much of its length. The Community Council did not feel that the houses were in keeping with the surrounding properties; there were also concerns about drainage, as the field drained onto the road, and about the capacity of the sewerage system, with fears that any spillage could result in the beach losing its Blue Flag status. She concluded by saying that this was not an appropriate development, and that there were other sites in the village that were more suitable.

Mrs Connie Stephens then addressed the Committee, speaking on behalf of the residents of Walton Road. Their concerns related to the scale of the development and she referred to a statement made by the Authority in December 2009 that it would be reasonable to develop no more than 8 dwellings on the site. This had increased to 10 dwellings through outline consent granted in 2014 and now a further increase to 18 dwellings was being sought. This was an increase of 125%. She felt that the housing stock of the village was sufficient to meet its needs with a large proportion of dwellings unoccupied. Further expansion would lead to an increase in the number of second homes. The second concern related to the visual intrusion of development, on what was an elevated site, of properties that were three-storeys high. Mrs Stephens believed this would have a visual impact on Walton Road and on Broad Haven more generally as well as being intrusive to the residents of Driftwood Close. She also stated that Walton Road was a very narrow lane that could not accommodate an additional 18 dwellings as it was used by a lot of heavy vehicles and had no pavement. She believed that a housing estate at this location would only be acceptable with a substantial road widening scheme. There were also concerns regarding drainage and sewerage. She concluded by



saying that the applicants appeared to be applying incrementally for greater density so that they could increase their profit. She also said that the erection of a large sign without planning permission showed the applicant's disregard for the site. She believed that Broad Haven should be treated with the same sensitivity as elsewhere and implored Members to visit the site.

Finally, the agent, Robin Williams, addressed the Committee. He pointed out that the site had the benefit of outline planning permission and was allocated for residential development. The principle of its development had therefore been long accepted. He went on to deal with the objections of the Community Council and stated that the density of the site was 27 dwellings per hectare, which was well below the norm these days and entirely in keeping with other estates in the village. With regard to visual impact, he suggested that the landscape impact should be considered against the fall-back position of the outline consent; the material change was the replacement of the large units by semi-detached dwellings, however their footprint remained the same. The application had also been accompanied by a landscape visual impact statement. Turning to highway and pedestrian access, Mr Williams noted that the Highway Authority had supported the application subject to a contribution towards provision of pavements to the village and the applicant had agreed to this. A drainage scheme had been submitted and this had been accepted. Surface water drainage would be implemented in accordance with SUDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems). Finally, he noted that development of the site would contribute towards the shortfall of housing in the National Park, in addition to providing 6 units of much needed affordable housing.

In answering Members' questions, Mr Williams said that removal of the sign erected without permission had been overlooked and he would take the matter back to the company's Managing Director. He also stated that the site was not viable for the development of 10 properties due to the abnormal costs. The Director of Planning added that, with regard to the occupation of the affordable units by 'local' people, this was standard for Registered Social Landlords who operated a cascade lettings policy.

Members sought clarification regarding the lower proportion of affordable housing proposed as part of the current scheme when compared to that granted permission in 2014. The officer explained that the Authority had revised its Supplementary Planning Guidance in 2014 and as part of this had reduced the percentage of affordable units to be provided on sites of two or more dwellings. As the need in Broad Haven was for 1 bed units, these only took up a small proportion of the site.



Councillor P Morgan then spoke as the County Councillor for The Havens expressing his concern at the increase in density on the site which would lead to increased traffic on what was a very narrow road and subject to congestion, particularly in the summer months, with few passing places. The road was used by the coastal bus and agricultural traffic. He believed the development was contrary to Policy 15 of the Local Development Plan which sought to protect and enhance the National Park. He asked the Committee to support a site visit.

The Monitoring Officer then reminded Councillor Morgan that Members did not represent their constituencies when sitting on the National Park Authority and that there were procedures to be followed when a Member wished to speak as a member of another Authority. Councillor Morgan therefore agreed it was appropriate for him to leave the room for the remainder of the debate on the application.

While Members were generally supportive of the application, they recognised the concern of the community, particularly with regard to access. They were also concerned that the provision of a footway on the roadside would make it even narrower and were not comfortable with delegating agreement of this aspect of the development to officers. It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to allow Members to undertake a site visit.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred and a site visit undertaken by the Committee.**

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

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/17/0346/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Lort-Phillips  
PROPOSAL: Relocation & redevelopment of Organic Dairy Farm including new organic dairy unit, slurry store, & calf shed  
LOCATION: Land at Lawrenny

It was reported that this application sought consent for the relocation of the existing dairy farm at Home Farm, located within the existing village of Lawrenny, to a site North East of the village off Broad Lane. The existing buildings/structures would be demolished following the commencement of the beneficial use of the proposed relocated farm. It was noted that the site of the demolished buildings was allocated for housing in the Local Development Plan (LDP).

It was reported at the Committee that the underpass element had been



removed from the application. The scale of the enterprise was acceptable to the Authority's agricultural advisor and its visual impact would be minimised with only fleeting glances of the agricultural buildings which were to be expected on agricultural land. There was a property on the opposite side of Broad Lane to the proposed development, however the separation distance of 54 metres was not considered to warrant a refusal.

Five letters of objection/concern had been received, and a summary of these was set out in the report. Notwithstanding these objections, officers considered that the proposed development complied with both national and local planning policies. The development would not give rise to any overriding concerns in respect of the impact on the special qualities of the National Park, landscape, amenity, highway safety or ecology. Furthermore, the development, through the recommended S106 agreement, would enable the landowner to progress the planning application for the development of 30 houses, 13 of which would be affordable, on the allocated site which was currently occupied by the existing farm buildings.

The recommendation was that delegated powers be given to the Director of Planning/Team Leader - Development Management to issue a decision notice granting planning permission in respect of the proposal, subject to conditions, once the applicant had entered into a S106 Agreement (within 6 months of the date of the Committee) to submit a valid planning application for the allocated site prior to the expiry of the current LDP and carry out the demolition of the existing farm buildings at Home farm in accordance with a demolition management plan to be submitted and agreed by the Authority.

Members asked the nature of the buildings to be demolished and the officer replied that they were not of any architectural merit and some were in a poor state. They asked about the colour of the silos and were advised that a condition could be added requiring them to be painted an appropriate colour. It was also requested that condition 4 be amended to require the treeline to be retained after the construction period had finished to screen the development from the neighbouring property.

Another Member asked if it was possible to require the specified number of affordable dwellings as set out in the LDP to be provided on the allocated site. Officers advised that this was not possible as it was a question of viability at the time of the application.

Finally Members asked about the slurry store, as this was an organic farm, and particularly given the likely introduction of a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ) around the Cleddau in the next 12 to 18 months. It was noted that the store had a 12 month capacity and the Agricultural Advisor



had assessed the application and was happy that the scale of the enterprise at Lawrenny Home farm would justify the size, scale and type of buildings on the proposed relocation site.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Director of Planning/Team Leader - Development Management to issue a decision notice granting planning permission in respect of the proposal, subject to a S106 Agreement and conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, surface water drainage, landscaping, archaeological scheme of investigation, construction environmental management plan, lighting, colour of silos and ecological design strategy.**

**A S106 Agreement, which should be entered into by the applicant within 6 months of the date of the Committee, should commit the applicant to submit a valid planning application for the allocated site prior to the expiry of the current LDP and carry out the demolition of the existing farm buildings at Home farm in accordance with a demolition management plan to be submitted and agreed by the Authority.**

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/17/0452/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mrs L Jenkins  
PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild curtilage & roadside wall and creation of a parking space on vacant land immediately north of Pentwyn  
LOCATION: Pentwyn, 6, St Brides View, Solva, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6TB

This application was reported to the Committee as the applicant had been a Member of the Authority within the last 12 months.

It was reported that the site lay within the Solva Conservation Area. Planning permission was required in this instance due to the presence of an Article 4 Direction which restricted usual permitted development rights for alterations to front curtilages. The works were also considered to be an engineering operation and would need specific consent on that basis also.

The site of the development featured a gently sloping piece of grass enclosed at the upper end by a low dry stone wall. The proposal sought to re-build the wall utilising the original stone and to re-grade the frontage area which was currently grassed, to allow for a parking space. The intention was to surface the area with grass as now, but over a 'grasscrete' type system.



The Building Conservation Officer was satisfied that there would be no detriment to the Conservation Area as a result of the proposals and they could therefore be supported subject to appropriate conditions.

The first of two speakers on this application was Ashley Heart. He objected to the demolition of the historic bank to create a parking space on land that people thought was common land, as it was not registered to anyone. He believed that the old Pembrokeshire stone wall was in excess of 300 years old and the buildings were of historical interest in the area. He felt that taking the wall down would change the aspect and visual appearance of the area to that which would not conform to what was expected in a conservation area, which was there to protect features of interest. Mr Heart did not believe that there was a need to create a parking space as there was more than adequate parking in the area, other than perhaps in the height of the summer season, and questioned whether its purpose was to add value to the cottage. The land was not currently used for parking, as the resident did not drive, but was kept in good order by Mr Heart himself. He also felt that removing the grassed area could create problems for the two bungalows opposite, one of which he recalled had been subject to flooding in the past. If permission were granted, he thought that bore holes should be required to establish what was under the grass and the volume of water contained by the bank.

The agent, Ian Bartlett, then addressed the Committee. He explained that the proposal was to construct a parking space due to the need to provide a convenient parking space for a carer, and also for any future occupier. He referred to a 1960's aerial photograph which had shown that the land had historically been used for parking, however it was currently a soft grassy surface. He believed that the stone wall and bank were slowly degrading and would likely become unstable over time. Mr Bartlett said he was aware of the sensitivity of the location and the adjoining narrow highway, and having received pre-application advice from the Building Conservation Officer and Highway Authority, found both to be supportive. The stone wall would be rebuilt using salvaged stone and the grassy area would look the same due to the use of a plastic grid mat which he believed would have negligibly less permeability compared to the grass. It was anticipated that it would allow the parking of a car the size of a typical family hatchback. He concluded by saying that in a conservation area, development should preserve or enhance, and he believed this would enhance the area.

Members did not believe that the situation with regarding to surface water drainage would change given the use of a permeable surface and were happy that it was recommended to condition any permission to require sustainable drainage.



**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, samples of stone and stonework and surface water drainage.**

- (i) REFERENCE: NP/17/0495/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Shannon  
PROPOSAL: Change of use of 15 camping pitches to 15 static caravans and ecological enhancement  
LOCATION: Windmills Caravan Park, Old Narberth Road, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 8TJ

It was reported at the meeting that this application had been withdrawn.

**NOTED.**

- (j) REFERENCE: NP/17/0548/FUL  
APPLICANT: Hean Castle Estate.  
PROPOSAL: Extension of cattle shed for beef herd & associated deposit of excavated material  
LOCATION: Land north of Hean Castle, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9AL

It was reported that the application was reported to the Committee as it was classed as a major development. The application site was on land forming part of an established 288 hectare farm enterprise and planning permission was sought for an extension to an existing cattle shed. The proposed building would incorporate a below ground nutrient management store, which would collect all slurry produced by the stock housed above. In order to minimise the height of the building in the landscape, the ground level for the extension would be lowered, and the excavated material arising from the development would be used to level out and create new grassland to the east of the site.

The design was clearly agricultural in nature and while the new extension was large in scale as a result of having to comply with current welfare standards for the housing of beef cattle, it was for an acknowledged need on land that already housed an agricultural building, thus it would not be considered to be visually intrusive. There was mature landscaping and trees surrounding the site which would balance out the visual appearance so that the resultant development would not be considered incompatible to the existing landscape setting. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The Authority's agricultural advisor supported the application and Natural Resources Wales had advised that they had no objection to the proposal



subject to inclusion of an advisory note regarding capacity of the slurry store.

It was reported at the meeting that if approval was granted, condition 3 set out in the report would be replaced with the standard landscape condition, and that there would be a condition regarding external lighting as recommended by the Ecologist.

The applicant, Mr David Lewis, spoke only to ask the Committee to support the application and to answer any questions Members had. However there were no questions, and the motion for approval of the application was proposed and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, landscaping, construction method statement, lighting and conditions as requested by the Coal Authority.**

#### **8. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader 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.

**NOTED.**

