

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

8 February 2017

Present: Councillor RM Lewis (Chair)

Mr A Archer, Councillor M Evans, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor P Harries, Councillor M James, Councillor L Jenkins, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Councillor D Rees, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor M Williams.

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 11.55am]

## 1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Hudson and Councillor R Kilmister. Mrs G Hayward was attending a National Parks UK meeting on behalf of the Authority.

## 2. Disclosures of interest

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

| <b>Application and Reference</b>   | <b>Member(s)/Officer(s)</b> | <b>Action taken</b>  |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| <i>Minutes 6(c)below</i><br>NP/16/0555 land to rear of Isfryn, Ponyglasier     | Councillor D Rees           | Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed  |
|  | Councillor P Harries        | Disclosed a personal but not prejudicial interest and remained in the room and played a full part in the discussion and voting |
| <i>Minutes 6(d)below</i><br>NP/16/00629 Picton Castle Walled Gardens, The Rhos | Mr AE Sangster              | Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed  |
| <i>Minutes 6(e)below</i><br>NP/16/00630 Picton Castle Walled Gardens, The Rhos | Mr AE Sangster              | Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed  |



|  |                            |   |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| <p><i>Minutes 6(h)below</i><br/> <i>NP/16/0677/FUL,</i><br/> <i>NP/16/0678/LBA,</i><br/> <i>NP/16/0679/FUL</i><br/> Restoration of Blackpool<br/> Mill, Narberth</p> | <p>Councillor A Wilcox</p> | <p>Remained in the<br/> room but played no<br/> part in the<br/> discussion or vote</p> |
|--|----------------------------|---|

### 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 14 December 2016 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 14 December 2016 be confirmed and signed.

### NOTED.

### 4. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 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>   |
|--|--|--|
| <p>NP/16/0314<br/> <i>Minute 6(a)</i><br/> <i>refers</i></p> | <p>Retrospective application for change of use of land for siting of timber lodge, cesspit &amp; concrete slab – land adjacent to Villa St Helens, Cliff Road, Wisemans Bridge, Narberth</p> | <p>Mr Tony Dinan,<br/> Objector</p>                                |
| <p>NP/16/0633<br/> <i>Minute 6(f)</i><br/> <i>refers</i></p> | <p>Refurbishment of existing cattle barn to form garden room, study and WC (retrospective) – 1 Square Farm, Marloes</p>  | <p>Cllr Peter Smithies,<br/> Community Council<br/> - objector</p> |
| <p>NP/16/0652<br/> <i>Minute 6(g)</i><br/> <i>refers</i></p> | <p>Retention of 5 static caravans occupied by agricultural workers for a period of 3 years &amp; retention of laundry building &amp; septic tank – Trewern, Felindre Farchog, Crymych</p>    | <p>Mr Irvine Johnson,<br/> Agent</p>                               |



## 5. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system and stated that planning decisions had to be made in accordance with statutory provisions and the adopted Local Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. It stressed that non-material considerations had to be disregarded when taking planning decisions and stated that personal circumstances were only very rarely material to planning decisions. The duty of the Authority carry out sustainable development in accordance with Part 2 of the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 was also highlighted. Provided members applied the Planning Acts lawfully and in a fair and impartial manner they would also comply with the Authority's duties under the Human Rights Act 1998 insofar as it applies to planning decisions. It was also important that Members applied the guidance contained in the Authority's Planning Code of Good Practice while carrying out their statutory duties.

### NOTED

## 6. Report of Planning Applications

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

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/16/0314/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs A Watkins  
PROPOSAL: Retrospective application for change of use of land for siting of timber lodge, cesspit & concrete slab  
LOCATION: Land adjacent to Villa St Helens, Cliff Road, Wisemans Bridge, Narberth

The report advised that this site lay between residential properties on sloping land outside of any defined settlement boundary and was therefore considered to be open countryside. The upper part of the site had been levelled, and a substantial mature tree and hedgerow removed to facilitate the installation of the timber lodge on site. The application was reported to the Committee as the recommendation was contrary to that of the Community Council.

It was reported that a previous consent for a Certificate of Lawfulness had been granted in 2015 on the basis of the previous use of the touring caravan on site having been occupied as holiday accommodation over the previous 30 years. A further application had been approved in May 2015



for the extended holiday occupation of the caravan to allow it to be occupied for holiday purposes throughout the year.

Although the principle of a caravan on the site had been established, the addition of a concrete slab and cesspit giving the lodge a high degree of permanence, as well as the height of it, meant that for planning purposes the timber lodge was now classed as a building.

Although a new residential building would normally be resisted on this site due to the open countryside location, the fall-back position in this case was for a twin-unit static caravan which could be placed (albeit without a concrete slab) on the site. This would be larger than the lodge currently present on site. Based on this consideration and that the proposed holiday use of the land had already been established, the application was supported in this instance.

The key impact of application on the special qualities of the National Park had been as a result of the removal of the boundary hedge and trees and their replacement with a 2m high vertically boarded timber fence. The applicant had therefore been asked to consider replacing the fence with a traditional timber fence and conditions were recommended requiring the further submission of a landscaping scheme which would soften the impact of the fence.

Officers took the view that the lodge was located a sufficient distance away from adjoining residential properties so as to not cause undue detriment to residential amenity, and subject to an amended boundary treatment or planting scheme and a replacement tree planting scheme to mitigate for the loss of hedgerow and mature tree, the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions set out in the report.

There was one speaker on this application, Mr Tony Dinan, a neighbour who was objecting. He circulated some photographs of the site and explained that planning permission for a small bungalow on the site had been refused on two occasions. However, he contended that the structure now on site was not a caravan but a small bungalow consisting of 3 bedrooms and two bathrooms – this would be evident if floor plans for the lodge had been supplied to the planning authority. Mr Dinan explained that the lodge filled the plot and he therefore considered it to be overdevelopment. With regard to the apparent fall-back position, he also contended that a larger structure couldn't be put on the site due to the existence of power cables. Page 4 of Mr Dinan's photographs showed the view from St Helens Apartment which now looked directly at the lodge, and also showed that it was not possible to replace the hedge as there was insufficient room.



Turning to drainage, Mr Dinan said that the cesspit that had been installed was 3,800 litres, while the recommended size for a dwelling occupied by six persons was 18,000. He calculated that it would require emptying potentially every four days, which he considered to be unacceptable as access would have to be gained via Cliff Road which formed the coast path in this location and was busy with walkers. He concluded by saying that the application should be refused.

Members were concerned regarding the potential for pollution from the cesspit and asked officers how this could be controlled. The officer replied that Welsh Water does not comment on such applications as it was not for a full time dwelling. Pembrokeshire County Council's Building Control Team had no jurisdiction over the structure, as for their purposes it was defined as a caravan. Therefore, the Authority proposed to condition any approval to require details of the implementation, maintenance and management of the soakaways and cesspit to ensure there was limited risk to the surrounding properties.

Several Members expressed the view that the application was contrary to policies 8, 9, 14 and 15 of the Local Development Plan (LDP) and also agreed that the structure was not a caravan – they were also concerned that a precedent could be set for replacement of caravans with timber lodges. Its bulky design was inappropriate for its site and setting and its landscape impact was marked, and this impact could not be mitigated. They were unhappy that the hedgerow had been removed and had grave reservations with the 2m high boarded fence. However, should the application be approved, they agreed that additional landscaping was required to improve amenity particularly between St Helen's Apartments and the timber lodge. It was also suggested that a site visit might be helpful.

Mindful of the fall-back position set out in the report, other Members felt that officers had taken a pragmatic approach.

The recommendation of approval was moved and seconded, however this vote was lost.

A motion to refuse the application was then proposed and seconded and as this would be contrary to the officer recommendation Members' reasons for refusal were sought. These were given as inappropriate design, landscape impact and an inability to mitigate the adverse impact, intensification of an inappropriate use, impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, concerns regarding sewerage disposal and the subsequent impact of frequent emptying on the narrow lane and coast path, loss of hedgerow and lack of a comprehensive landscaping scheme, overdevelopment as well as being contrary to all the criteria in Policy 15 of



the LDP. The Director of Planning advised that these were valid planning grounds, and that she would not instigate the Authority's "Cooling Off" procedure on this occasion if the application was refused contrary to the officer recommendation.

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

1. The development by virtue of its form, nature, appearance and location is insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape causing significant visual intrusion and resulting in the loss of important traditional features which are particularly visible as the site lies on the Pembrokeshire Coast National Trail/Wales Coastal Path. The development intensifies a use which is incompatible with its location and fails to harmonise with, or enhance the landscape character of the National Park. The development has a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the adjacent properties, and a detrimental visual impact on the immediate and wider area and the special qualities of the National Park and is, therefore, contrary to the requirements of Policies 1 ( National Park Purposes and Duty), 7 ( Countryside), 8 (Special Qualities), 15 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), 30 ( Amenity) of the adopted Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/16/0502/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr D Brown  
PROPOSAL: Amendment to NP/15/0526/FUL comprising change of use of first floor from staff/managers accommodation to 3 guest rooms, new fire escape, new first floor balcony, foyer extension & change of fenestration/fascia details to white upvc  
LOCATION: Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier, Tenby

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn.

**NOTED.**

*[Councillor D Rees disclosed an interest and withdrew from the meeting while the following application was considered. Councillor P Harries disclosed a personal interest only and remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting.]*



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/16/0555/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mrs L Parkes  
PROPOSAL: Change of use of land and siting of shepherds hut for seasonal holiday accommodation together with associated washroom and boardwalk (partly retrospective)  
LOCATION: Land to the rear of Isfryn, Pontyglasier, Crymych

Members were reminded that this application had previously been reported to the Committee in December 2016, however no decision was reached at the meeting and it was therefore agreed that the application would be referred to the next available meeting of the Committee for further discussion.

Since the last meeting, it was reported that support for the proposal had been received from the Community Council which considered it would promote tourism in the area. The agent had also submitted eight letters of support as well as details of drainage proposals and landscaping. Neither Welsh Water nor Pembrokeshire County Council had raised any objection to the drainage proposed, and the landscape was also considered appropriate. It was also noted that the applicant had approached The Greener Camping Club regarding the possibility of the site becoming a certificated camping site, however this option had not been pursued pending determination of the current planning application. It was clarified that under such certification all structures, including the washroom, had to be mobile and removable.

Having considered the application against the policies of the Local Development Plan, officers considered that the current proposal was contrary to policies which indicated that no further new camp sites would be supported. No material considerations had been put forward which would outweigh the very clear policy positions set out and as such the application was recommended for refusal.

As the application had been debated fully at the previous meeting, the recommendation of refusal was moved and seconded. However, some Members remained uncertain, noting that no objections had been received to the application which was small in size, had little visual impact and would bring an economic benefit to the area. Another Member noted that a variety of accommodation was helpful, and this application provided something different. A motion to approve the application was therefore moved and seconded, however this vote was lost. The substantive motion to refuse the application was then put to the vote and this was won.

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



1. **Policies 1, 8, 15 and 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seek to protect and enhance the sense of remoteness and tranquillity of the landscape, and prevent development that fails to harmonise with or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park. The proposed development – due to its location and siting – fails to protect or enhance the sense of remoteness and tranquillity in the landscape and also fails to harmonise or enhance the landform and landscape character, which is harmful to the special qualities of the National Park, and therefore is contrary to adopted Development Plan Policy Policy 8 – criterion (c), and Policy 15 - criteria (b) and (d).**
2. **Policy 35 and 38 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan states that new camping, caravanning, static caravan or chalet sites will not be permitted in the National Park. The provision of a new campsite and associated development is therefore contrary to adopted Development Plan Policy 35 – criterion (a), and Policy 38.**

*[Mr AE Sangster disclosed an interest in the following two applications and withdrew from the room while they were considered.]*

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/16/0629/FUL  
APPLICANT: Picton Castle Trust  
PROPOSAL: Erection of tractor shed, glass house and bat house, provision of flue to teaching room  
LOCATION: Picton Castle Walled Garden, The Rhos

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as an employee of the Authority and a former Member of the Authority were trustees of the Picton Castle Trust.

The site lay north of the Grade II listed walled garden at Picton Castle, and within a registered Park/Garden; it was also on the Authority's Buildings at Risk register. The garden had lean-to structures to its north side, including the teaching room. The existing collapsed greenhouse to the north was to be rebuilt and the substandard tool shed replaced by a tractor shed. These proposals formed part of the drive to improve the visitor amenity of Picton Castle and gardens and had been the subject of a successful grant application to the Heritage Lottery Fund.

No adverse comment had been received from statutory consultees and officers considered that the proposal was appropriate in terms of size, scale and detail. Since writing the report, Natural Resources Wales had





responded that it had no objection to the proposal subject to conditions. As such the application was supported subject to conditions.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, finishes of the external stove pipe, bat mitigation measures, species licence, external lighting plan, submission of a method reptile statement and archaeological investigation work.**

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/16/0630/LBA  
APPLICANT: Picton Castle Estate  
PROPOSAL: Conservation & restoration of historic garden buildings and ancillary structures including reinstatement of glasshouse, to provide improved public access interpretation  
LOCATION: Picton Castle Walled Garden, The Rhos

It was reported that this application fell within the provisions of the listed building delegation direction awarded to this Authority by Welsh Government. However it was before the Committee as an employee of the Authority and a former Member of the Authority were trustees of the Picton Castle Trust.

The proposal comprised works to restore the walls, gates and lean-to buildings within the Grade II Listed walled garden. This would include careful recording and like-for-like replacement of features.

Officers considered that the proposed scheme was in keeping with, and would respect the character of, the existing historic building and its sensitive setting in terms of detail. It was also considered to comply with the requirement of Circular 61/96 and Cadw's Conservation Principles and could therefore be supported subject to conditions. Since writing the report, Natural Resources Wales had responded that they had no objection to the proposal subject to conditions. It was also noted that there was a typographical error in the reason for condition 1 which should refer to Section 18 of the Conservation and Listed Building Act rather than the Town and Country Planning Act.

Members were pleased to see the buildings being brought back into use and the recommendation was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, finishes of the external stove pipe, bat mitigation measures, species licence, external lighting plan and submission of a method reptile statement.**



- (f) REFERENCE: NP/16/0633/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr D Chambers  
PROPOSAL: Refurbishment of existing cattle barn to form garden room, study and WC (Retrospective)  
LOCATION: 1 Square Farm, Marloes

It was reported that planning permission had originally been granted in 2012 for the replacement of a dilapidated cattle shed with a new structure on the same footprint. In their consideration of this original proposal, officers had noted that the most visible change to the design was that the roof was to be increased by one metre in height and that the structure would be clad in horizontal timber boards. The proposal was considered acceptable within the village setting and was supported by officers, subject to conditions including that the structure was to be only used for purposes ancillary to the dwellinghouse.

Following investigation by the Authority's enforcement officers, this current planning application had been submitted in order to regularise the development which had not been built in accordance with the 2012 permission. This related to the height of the building to the ridge, which had increased by 0.93m, the depth of the structure with the rear wing having increased by 1m and the insertion of two roof lights to the rear elevation of the building.

Since the officer's report had been published, the agent had reviewed the objections and had responded to say that the larger size of the building had been due to an error in construction, however he did not believe that this was unduly harmful to the neighbouring property. A retrospective application had been submitted to regularise the situation and this would be considered on the merits of the case, with no precedent. Construction had been to a high standard and the building was sympathetic to its location.

Officers considered that the proposal was an acceptable form of development within the existing setting and use of the site, and ample private parking and amenity space was available to the property. As such it was supported subject to a condition that its use should be ancillary to the dwellinghouse.

There was one speaker, Peter Smithies, who spoke on behalf of Marloes and St Brides Community Council. He began by summarising the history of the site, saying that the Community Council (CC) had been led to believe that the development was a simple rebuild of what was a dilapidated cattle shed, however it had always had reservations over the height of the building. The Authority had approved the application and



building work had commenced in November 2015. It was clear that a larger building than had been approved was being erected and the Authority was notified of this, however it took no action until 23 weeks had passed and the building was completed. This increased size was not a simple mistake as the building was prefabricated off site. A complaint regarding the delay in responding had been made to the Authority and this was upheld by the Monitoring Officer and a formal apology was made. Mr Smithies contended that if the Authority had acted sooner, construction could have been stopped. The CC understood that the barn was supposed to have been of single storey so that there would be no impact on neighbouring properties and the scale of the proposal was a direct reflection of the cattle barn. However, Mr Smithies said that the building was 100% bigger in size when what had actually been built was compared with the details given in the design and access statement. He stated that the recommendation of approval was a cover up. The CC had concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties and was critical of the inaction of officers and the unexplained delay which it considered to be a dereliction of duty. It was stated that trust was built on performance and in this instance the Authority had failed to deliver.

Members were concerned at the delay in acting on the Community Council's concerns and the Development Management Team Leader replied that enforcement was an area that was being looked at. A Member added that local residents were angry over what had happened and it was not possible to defend the actions of the Authority. He was concerned that if the application was approved, the Authority would lose standing and reputation in the community and believed that the application should be refused.

While not wishing to dismiss the concerns of the community, other Members pointed out that issues regarding enforcement had to be put to one side and the application determined on its merits. They noted that a structure was already permitted at this location and what had been built was not significantly bigger. There was some confusion over how much bigger the actual building was compared to what had been permitted, the officer calculating just over 35% while the Community Council believed it to be 45% and Members requested that this be clarified.

Members also expressed concern about the amenity of neighbours and asked whether a condition regarding additional landscaping could be added and also looked for assurances that this would be implemented. Officers agreed that such a condition could be included.



A Member then suggested that the Committee visit Marloes to see for themselves the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties and this was seconded and voted upon.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred until the next available meeting to allow the Committee to carry out a site inspection.**

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/16/0652/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr M Watkins  
PROPOSAL: Retention of 5 static caravans occupied by agricultural workers for a period of 3 years & retention of laundry building and septic tank  
LOCATION: Trewern Farm, Felindre Farchog, Crymych

The Committee was reminded that a site visit to Trewern Farm had been carried out in October 2015 in association with a retrospective planning application for a number of agricultural buildings, a slurry lagoon and a silage clamp, which was subject to the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. A Screening Direction from Welsh Government in January 2016 confirmed the application required an Environmental Assessment which the Authority was still awaiting. A Certificate of Lawfulness for the silage clamp and slurry lagoon had since been submitted but this had not yet been determined.

It was reported that Trewern Farm operated as a dairy farm with 304 hectares located on two separate parcels of land, one at Trewern with the remainder being at Penpedwast. The farm had a dairy herd of 1000 cows, with approximately 100 dairy replacements also being on the holding.

The application detailed there being 10 employees in addition to the applicant, four of whom lived off site and 4-6 full time workers drawn from a pool of 10 who worked on a three-month shift pattern, all of whom were housed in the static caravans the subject of this application; some of the caravans had been on site for seven years.

The Authority's agricultural consultant had appraised the current scheme and had advised that while the application met the financial and time tests set out in Technical Advice Note (TAN) 6, he did not see any requirement for the workers to live on site. Also the holding had a number of Listed curtilage outbuildings which could be converted to provide suitable accommodation.

In addition, the appearance of the caravans on the approach to the historic farm buildings was not considered to be in keeping with the principles of preserving the appearance of the historic landscape and the



caravans themselves did not have the standard of private amenity space which would ordinarily be afforded to a dwelling, and had a poor relationship between themselves in terms of privacy.

Officers concluded that based on the fact that a second dwelling had been approved at Trewern in 1991 as an agricultural dwelling, and that this proposal failed to meet the requirements of TAN 6, with no clear need for the workers to be housed on site, together with the adverse impact on the wider landscape, the application was recommended for refusal.

The Agent, Mr Irvine Johnson, then addressed the Committee. He felt that the application had been brought to Committee with undue haste, the eight-week period for determination of the application expired that day. He therefore asked the Committee to defer the application to allow extra time to address officers' concerns, the report stating several times that additional information needed to be provided. He noted that an enforcement notice was pending on the caravans seeking their removal within 6 months, however if this was implemented it would lead to problems for the continued operation of the holdings, which had a turnover of £3.7 million. He believed that the issues had not been thoroughly understood and those relating to landscape and amenity could be addressed. He added that the scale of the operation meant that multiple workers were needed on site at one time and the three-month rotation of workers had implications for the ability to find alternative accommodation. While conversion of buildings on the holding was a potential solution, granting a 3-year temporary permission would allow time for this to be considered effectively. He also noted that as a result of the UK's decision to leave the EU, there was also uncertainty over the need for the accommodation in the longer term.

Members noted that the farm was a large business in the locality and its loss would be highly detrimental to the area and this was a significant consideration. It was felt that deferral of the application until the next meeting would allow information on, for example, the cost of alternative accommodation to be provided.

The Director of Planning pointed out that the development was unauthorised, and that she believed there was already sufficient information available to officers to recommend refusing the application. If refused, the applicant could undoubtedly appeal and this would extend time periods for permanent solutions to be considered.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred until the next available meeting of the Committee to allow the applicant time to provide the further information.**



*[Councillor A Wilcox disclosed an interest in the following application and did not vote]*

- (h) 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 658sqm all-weather events barn & associated facilities, cycle parking, car parking, site infrastructure including drainage services along with hard & soft landscaping & boundary treatments  
LOCATION: Blackpool Mill, Blackpool Bridge, Narberth
- REFERENCE: NP/16/0678/LBA  
APPLICANT: Bluestone National Park Resorts Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Conversion & restoration of existing mill building & ancillary buildings to provide heritage tourist facility  
LOCATION: Blackpool Mill, Blackpool Bridge, Narberth
- 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

It was reported that Blackpool Mill was a Grade II\* Listed building dating from 1813. The Mill had been converted into a tourist attraction in 1968 and was listed in 1971 as an exceptionally fine industrial building which survived virtually intact and included a full working set of machinery.

The development proposed to convert Blackpool Mill into an 'immersive Victorian attraction' with ancillary development to the west and south of the Mill including a narrow gauge steam railway, station platforms, visitor walks, all weather events barn including catering element, car and coach parking on the opposite side of the road, conversion of an existing building to an engine shed, conversion of an existing building to a café for fish and chips, main mill building to be used for tea room, milling experience, history / discovery experience and creative crafts. A proposal for a land train route from the Bluestone Resort to Blackpool Mill was also proposed as part of the overall development.



As these formed major development, Members were requested to consider a Committee site visit to view the site and its surroundings prior to consideration of the planning and listed buildings applications at a subsequent Committee meeting.

**DECISION: That a site visit to Blackpool Mill take place, prior to consideration of the applications at a future meeting of the Committee.**

## **7. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 4 appeals against planning decisions made by the Authority) that were currently lodged with the Welsh Government, and detailed which stage of the appeal process had been reached to date in every case.

It was reported that the One Planet Development appeal relating to land adjacent to Castle Hill, Newport had been dismissed and the application for costs refused. This decision would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee.

The decision relating to Land off Trewarren Road, St Ishmaels had also been dismissed and the application for costs refused and this was appended to the report for Members information.

**NOTED.**

