

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

14 March 2018

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

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

[Councillor P Kidney arrived during consideration of Item 4, Solicitor's report]

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 1.10pm]

### 1. Apology

There was an apology for absence from Dr RM Plummer.

### 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>Minute 6(b)below NP/17/0315/FUL</i> Residential development comprising 18 dwellings with associated works, land off Walton Road, Broad Haven	<i>Councillor P Morgan</i>	Withdrew from the meeting while the applications were discussed
<i>Minute 6(d)below NP/17/0574/FUL</i> Alteration to existing boundary walls and creation of a new dwelling, Velfrey Cottage, Church Terrace, Saundersfoot	<i>Councillor P Baker</i>	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions thereon
<i>Minutes 6(g) and (h) below NP/18/0042/FUL and NP/18/0043/LBA</i> Works to rear wing including alteration of	<i>Councillor M Evans</i>	Withdrew from the meeting while the applications were discussed



fenestration and  
provision of roof lights, 1  
Albert View, St Julians  
Street, Tenby

*Minute 7 below  
EC17/0082 Land at  
Buttyland Caravan &  
Camping Park,  
Manorbier*

*Councillor M Evans  
Councillor P Kidney*

Withdrew from the  
meeting while the  
application was  
discussed

### 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 31 January 2018 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 31 January 2018 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>
NP/17/0283/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers, Land at Station Road, Manorbier, Tenby</i>	Proposed erection of 23 affordable homes with associated access, parking, landscaping & engineering works	Jonathan Fiddy, Objector
NP/17/0574/FUL <i>Minute 6(d) refers, Velfrey Cottage, Church Terrace, Saundersfoot</i>	Alteration to existing boundary walls and creation of a new dwelling	Pamela Mortimer, Objector Steve Hole, Agent



<p>NP/17/0706/FUL Minute 6(f) <i>refers, Five Arches Car Park, South Parade, Tenby</i></p>	<p>Change of use of land fronting South Parade (former commercial garage, workshops and car parking) to car parking to enable use of the entire site (including 7 Picton Road) as a permanent car park together with works to the entire site comprising associated pay machines, electric charging points, lighting, signage &amp; planters</p>	<p>Andrew Davies, Tenby Town Council Giles Birt, 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 to 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

## 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/17/0283/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr S Stalbow, Pembrokeshire Housing Association  
PROPOSAL: Proposed erection of 23 affordable homes with associated access, parking, landscaping & engineering works  
LOCATION: Land at Station Road, Manorbier, Tenby

It was reported that this site was allocated within the Local Development Plan for 19 residential units and the application was before the Committee as it was classed as a major development. The current application sought to increase the number of units on the site to 23, arranged around a new estate road. Officers considered that the increase in density of development was not significant, and that the development would be acceptably sited within the Rural Centre at Manorbier Station. The layout for the proposed development demonstrated the retention of the important belt of trees to the eastern edge of the site. The site was in reasonable proximity to existing services and public transport and as such the additional residential units on the site above those allocated could be supported.

The site comprised a roughly square, densely vegetated parcel of land which was very visible in the immediate street scene. It was considered that the housing layout related acceptably with the developed character of Manorbier Station and could be delivered in a way that did not impact unacceptably on general visual amenity of this part of Manorbier. It was also considered that the site could be developed without adversely impacting the amenity of existing residents.

The responses of Statutory Consultees were set out in the report and, with the exception of Manorbier Community Council which recommended refusal, were of either conditional consent or no objection. It was reported at the meeting that following submission of the protected species survey, the Ecologist had advised that there was no object to the proposal subject to an additional condition regarding ecological enhancement.

Officers concluded that the principle of development of this site for affordable housing purposes was acceptable. The increase in density would not be considered harmful to the setting, and subject to the provision of a legal agreement, the proposal could be supported by officers. The recommendation set out in the report was, however, amended to delegate to officers to grant planning permission subject to no less than 50% of the dwellings being built and retained as affordable housing. If the Section 106 legal agreement was not completed within 3 months, delegated power be given to officers to refuse the application. Conditions were also set out in the report, together with the additional condition suggested by the ecologist.



There was one speaker, Mr Jonathan Fiddy, an objector, who was also speaking on behalf of six of his neighbours. Mr Fiddy referred to a statement in Planning Policy Wales which he said indicated a need for balanced and mixed communities, and he feared that the large number of affordable homes proposed by this and other nearby developments would over-balance the community, there being no information to support the need for such a large number of affordable units. He was also concerned about the loss of trees, the lack of open space and play facilities for residents of the proposed dwellings and the inaccuracy of bus and train availability. Mr Fiddy went on to refer to the representations made by the Community Council which questioned the sustainability of the site and the lack of a planning brief for it as he did not believe that these points had been addressed. Finally, he noted that the amended application referred to the provision of a pumping station on land at Buttyland, however no application for such a facility had been approved. In response to a question from Members, Mr Fiddy also expressed concerns regarding traffic congestion in the area associated with school drop-off and pick-up.

One Member said that he was unsure if this development related to Manorbier or Jameston and he shared Mr Fiddy's concerns regarding traffic around the site, infrequent bus and train services, particularly in winter and no footpath to the station which was on an unlit road. This left the option of a two mile walk to Manorbier shop which was not felt to be feasible. He also felt that insufficient attention had been paid to the comments made by the Community Council. The Member also referred to another development on the outskirts of Jameston and feared that this over provision of affordable housing would lead to people being brought into the community who did not want to live there. Another Member questioned whether there was sufficient capacity in the school to accommodate a large number of children, and the sufficiency of parking associated with the development was also questioned. It was suggested that Members would benefit from visiting the site and this was proposed and seconded.

Officers responded to the points made, advising that the site had been allocated in the Local Development Plan, and therefore the Inspector had been happy with the provision. With regard to traffic, the Highway Authority had advised that speeds in the area would be low and therefore highway safety would not be compromised. They were also satisfied with the level of parking as the location was served by public transport. There was considered to be sufficient amenity space, and most of the trees the subject of a Tree Preservation Order were being retained; there would also be other planting on the site. Turning to the pumping station, the officer advised that the applicant (Pembrokeshire Housing Association) was keeping its options open by suggesting an alternative site for this



facility. However the pumping station proposed as part of the application was capable of coming forward – and could stand alone.

With regard to the school, it was noted that it currently has sufficient capacity, however parents might choose to send their children to other schools in the area.

It was also confirmed that the development would slightly more than satisfy the current need for affordable housing in the community according to the housing need register administered by Pembrokeshire County Council

Other Members noted that the Authority had been criticised for its lack of delivery of affordable housing and welcomed the delivery of housing on LDP allocated sites. It was felt that the concerns of the community did not outweigh the merits of this application that was in line with local and national planning policy.

A vote was then taken on an amendment to delegate approval of the application as set out in the report and subject to the amendments advised earlier in the meeting, which had been proposed and seconded, however this was lost.

A vote then took place on the motion to undertake a site visit and this was won.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow Members to visit the site.**

*[Councillor P Morgan disclosed an interest and withdrew from the meeting while the following application was considered]*

- (b) 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

Members were reminded that at the meeting of the Committee in November 2017 it was resolved to undertake a site inspection to this location which took place on 20 November 2017. Since that time discussions with the applicants, agents and Highway Authority had taken place in order to achieve a safe access and link between the site and Broad Haven village. As a result of these discussions, the applicant now proposed to undertake highway improvements to Walton Road which would consist of the creation of traffic calming measures which would



have similar results to a 'Quiet Lane' between its junctions with Settlands Hill and Walton West crossroads; 'Quiet Lanes' were noted to be a designation in England for rural roads which were appropriate for shared use by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and motorised users.

The introduction of measures to produce an effect broadly equivalent to a "Quiet Lane" at this location was considered by officers to be an appropriate dual user and traffic calming measure; it required the use of signage to indicate the extent of the traffic calming measures and, being within an already developed part of the settlement, this was not considered to be obtrusive within this setting. The Highway Authority had advised that they had no objection to this proposal as submitted, subject to the necessary highway agreements being concluded. As the proposals would involve works outside of the application 'red line', these would be secured by a 'Grampian' condition as set out in the report.

It was also reported that a Construction Management Plan had been submitted and therefore condition 3 as set out in the report was no longer required. A further letter had been received from a neighbouring property regarding water runoff, however officers considered that these concerns would be dealt with through the proposed condition related to drainage.

It was therefore recommended that, subject to conditions as set out in the report, planning permission be granted subject to agreement of a Section 106 Legal Agreement to address planning obligations relating to the provision of 35% of the dwellings being built and maintained as affordable housing units and payment of contributions towards play equipment and community facilities. If the Section 106 legal agreement was not completed within 3 months, delegated powers be granted to officers to refuse permission.

Some Members remained concerned regarding the density of dwellings on the site, as the original allocation had been for the provision of 8 residential units; it was also asked whether the Community Council was now happy with the traffic calming measures. Other Members questioned whether there could be any control over the timing of construction, visual impact and whether signage would be bilingual. The officer replied that the construction management plan did not specify a time of year, however all signage would be bilingual and the Tree and Landscape Officer was happy that the site would be appropriately screened. No further correspondence had been received from the Community Council.

**DECISION: That planning permission be granted, subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement which addresses the following necessary planning obligations:**



- **Procure that 35% of the dwellings built on the site pursuant to the planning permission are built and thereafter maintained as affordable housing units in perpetuity;**
- **Pay planning contributions towards play equipment and community facilities;**
- **If the Section 106 legal agreement is not completed within 3 months of the resolution then delegated powers be given to the Chief Executive/Director of Park Direction/Team Leader Development Management to refuse permission on non-compliance with Policies 45 & 48**

**and subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, footway improvements and Quiet Lane measures, surface water disposal, parking and turning, accordance with Construction Environmental Management Plan, hours of construction and lighting.**

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/17/0420/FUL  
 APPLICANT: Mr E Davies  
 PROPOSAL: Conversion of existing first floor flat to 3 self contained units, first floor extensions & alterations to ground floor café to provide undercover stairwell to flats above  
 LOCATION: Pirate Café, Amroth, Narberth

This application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee in January 2018, when Members were minded to approve the application contrary to national and local policy. A ‘cooling-off’ period was invoked by the Director of Park Direction and Planning with the final decision to be taken at the next meeting of the Committee.

The report before Members detailed the reasons why officers considered that the development was not acceptable in terms of national and local policy. In addition, the report also referred to a further application ‘called in’ by Welsh Ministers in respect of residential development on a site which straddled a C2 and C1 flood zone in Rhondda Cynon Taf (APP/L6940/V/16/3163541 refers). Officers highlighted that national policy stated that the development for a vulnerable land use, i.e. residential, should not be permitted in C2 flood zones.

It was reported at the meeting that the further information submitted by the applicant had been sent to Natural Resources Wales (NRW), however no further comments had been received, and the officer recommendation remained one of refusal. Members expressed their unhappiness that NRW had declined to comment.





Mr Emyr Williams, Coastal and Rivers Engineer with Pembrokeshire County Council, was present at the meeting to answer Members' questions. He explained that Planning Authorities were now in a transition period as there were buildings like the one under consideration which were built in the 1950/60s when there was little awareness of flood risk. There was little that could be done about those existing buildings, however national policy had been developed to prevent putting more people at risk in the future by not allowing additional development for vulnerable uses. He emphasised that the current policy for Amroth was one of managed retreat in the longer term, the properties would be likely to flood as a result of sea level rise which could result in water flowing onto the lower lying land behind the property.

Members, however, maintained that the same number of people would be at risk with or without this development, and the increased publicity and conditions attached to any planning permission resulting from this application would be more likely to reduce the risk rather than increase it. When asked the question Mr Williams confirmed that 8 people in one property or 8 persons in 3 properties would be presented with the same risk. Members put greater weight on the wellbeing of the existing business, considering that the financial risk was with the applicant. Approval of the application, subject to the conditions set out in the report, and the requirement to complete a unilateral undertaking in respect of the affordable housing contribution was therefore moved and seconded.

Other Members, however believed that the Committee could be considered reckless in overriding expert advice and recalled that there had once been cottages on the opposite side of the road which had been destroyed by the sea. They pointed out that the proposed development was clearly contrary to national and local policy and did not believe that the other considerations being put forward outweighed this policy position. An amendment to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the report was also moved and seconded, however this vote was lost.

As the application had been subject to the Authority's 'cooling off' procedure, there was a requirement for a recorded vote to be taken on the substantive motion to approve the application subject to conditions and a unilateral undertaking. The result of this was as follows:

For: Councillor P Baker, Councillor Mrs D Clements, Councillor M Evans, Mrs G Hayward, Mrs J James, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor P Morgan, Mr AE Sangster and Councillor A Wilcox (9 votes)

Against: Mr A Archer, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor P Harries, Dr R Heath-Davies, Councillor M James, Councillor M Williams, Councillor S Yelland (7 votes)

Abstention: Councillor R Owens



**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to submission of a completed unilateral undertaking with regard to an affordable housing contribution. If this was not submitted within 2 months, delegated authority was granted to officers to refuse the application. The permission would also be subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans and any flood mitigation measures required by Natural Resources Wales.**

*[Councillor P Baker disclosed a personal interest in the following application, however he remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion]*

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/17/0574/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr D Slade  
PROPOSAL: Alteration to existing boundary walls and creation of a new dwelling  
LOCATION: Velfrey Cottage, Church Terrace, Saundersfoot

It was reported that planning approval was sought for the sub-division of the garden of Velfrey Cottage to form a plot for a new two storey three bedroomed residential dwelling. The proposed works would alter the existing stone frontage boundary wall to create a new access and delivery bay. Above the wall, a lean-to en-suite bathroom and external log store would be provided which would also extend the stone wall vertically. The application had been reported to the Committee because the views of Saundersfoot Community Council were contrary to the recommendation of officers.

Following consideration of local and national policies and having regard to all material considerations, officers considered that the development offered an opportunity to protect and enhance the local centre of Saundersfoot. The development would be in keeping with the aims of the LDP in that the development would conserve and enhance the existing character of the conservation area. As such, and subject to a schedule of conditions, the development was considered to be acceptable and the recommendation was one of approval.

The first of two speakers was Mrs Pamela Mortimer, who was objecting to the application. She was concerned that, should the application be approved, several of the conditions required documents to be submitted prior to the commencement of development and questioned why they were not required prior to determination of the application. Her concerns related firstly to road safety. Mrs Mortimer pointed out that Church Terrace was a one-way street and was on a bus route, therefore any blockage of the road had a potential to cause gridlock – this concern had also been raised by Saundersfoot Community Council. There were also



concerns regarding the safety of those using the footpath, particularly children walking to school, as access to the loading bay was over that footway and was also near the entrance to Wogan Lane which was a concealed entrance. The development was also considered to be out of character with the rest of the area and she was dismayed at the loss of trees. Neighbours Mr & Mrs Jones who lived opposite endorsed these concerns and were also concerned about maintaining access to their property. Mrs Mortimer was also concerned about privacy and loss of amenity as she lived in the line of sight between the proposed dwelling and the sea. She suggested that Members visit the site, particularly when the children were coming out of school and the area was particularly congested.

The second speaker was Mr Steve Hole, the agent, who responded to several of the points made by Mrs Mortimer. With regard to road safety arising from a single lane carriageway, he noted that the road was 4m wide in addition to the footway. As a standard carriageway was 2.5m wide, there was sufficient width to allow a temporary footway in the roadway – any such temporary diversion would be set out in the construction management plan required by the proposed conditions. Once the development was complete, the provision of a loading bay would negate the need for parking on the highway and thus maintain the traffic flow. A parking space was not considered necessary as adequate parking was available along Francis Lane. With regard to privacy, great care had been taken to ensure that no window overlooked neighbouring properties; Mrs Mortimer's property was 22m away from the proposed dwelling and was faced at first floor level by an obscured glazed window. The lounge window facing that property was at a lower level due to the topography of the site. There were proposals to enhance the landscaping with indigenous hedgerow planting once the site had been cleared.

One of the Members asked about works to the retaining wall and expressed concern regarding the passage of wide loads if the roadway was restricted, even temporarily. He was aware that caravans being delivered to a nearby caravan site currently had to drive on the pavement in order to get through. The agent pointed out that the developer would have to submit a Construction Management Plan which should deal with such matters and would likely schedule deliveries outside of school drop-off and pick-up times.

The concerns of the Community Council were highlighted by one of the Members, these being a proposal for a large building in an elevated area within the Conservation Area. He considered that physical construction of the dwelling would be difficult and proposed that Members visit the site. This was seconded.



**DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow Members to undertake a site visit.**

*[The Committee adjourned for ten minutes]*

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/17/0665/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr M Lewis  
PROPOSAL: Partial demolition of existing boundary wall.  
Construction of new vehicular access and new boundary wall  
LOCATION: Hilston, Parrog Road, Newport

It was reported that planning permission was sought for the partial demolition of a stone boundary wall along the roadside frontage in order to create a vehicular access and off-street parking to service this residential property. The proposed works included the removal of an existing section of the roadside boundary wall in order to create the vehicular access. It was also proposed to lower the height of a further 7.3m section of wall in order to create a visibility splay. A new boundary wall was proposed which would be set back from the lowered outer wall, built using the reclaimed surplus stone and also incorporating the quartz coping stones to match both the height and finish of the existing wall.

The application was before the Committee as the officer's recommendation differed from that of Newport Town Council.

Officers considered that, notwithstanding the objection raised by Newport Town Council, the proposed development would not result in an adverse visual impact on the conservation area or on the special qualities of the National Park, nor would it have any detrimental impact on the surrounding amenity. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.

While not all Members agreed that there would be no detrimental impact on the Conservation Area, it was agreed that parking on Parrog Road was badly needed. Having ascertained that the existing line of the wall would be maintained, and that the wall would be rebuilt re-using existing stone, the recommendation to approve the application was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, sample stonework, gate finishes and maintenance of the visibility splay.**



- (f) REFERENCE: NP/17/0706/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr G Birt, Five Arches Car Park Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Change of use of land fronting South Parade (former commercial garage, workshops and car parking) to car parking to enable use of the entire site (including 7 Picton Road) as a permanent car park together with works to the entire site comprising associated pay machines, electric charging points, lighting, signage & planters  
LOCATION: Five Arches Car Park, South Parade, Tenby

It was reported that permission was sought for the provision of 102 parking spaces on this site which currently had temporary permission as a car park, initially granted (against officer recommendation) in 2011 and renewed in 2015. The application was before the Committee as the recommendation of Tenby Town Council was contrary to that of officers.

In policy terms, the site was formerly an employment site, and Policy 43 of the Local Development Plan sought to protect against the loss of such sites, unless the present use was inappropriate for the locality, was unviable or there was adequate alternative provision in the vicinity. Officers did not consider that the current proposal met with these criteria and as such it was contrary to Policy 43.

In addition, the site was located within the centre of the town and proposals which sought to increase traffic in this area were contrary to both national and local planning policies which were to reduce the need to travel and not to intensify traffic flows in already congested areas. Tenby was well-served by public transport which should be given priority. The traffic management strategy for Tenby relied on removing traffic from the town centre through pedestrianisation and providing park and ride links from peripheral car parks. Due to existing car park capacity for a majority of the year in Tenby, an increase in parking provision was likely to result in increased redundancy for most of the year. The location of the car park would also lead to an increase in the amount of traffic circulating in the town which would not serve to promote a quality pedestrian environment.

It was concluded that while the views of the Town Council were noted, at no time had a need for an additional car park been demonstrated with evidence of a shortage of car parking in Tenby. The continued use of this car park would result in inefficient use of otherwise developable land, and the additional traffic being drawn into Tenby creating traffic management issues would be contrary to the process of removing inappropriate parking and trips to/from Tenby. As such, the proposed scheme for the permanent use of the site for car parking was considered to be contrary to



national and local planning policy and also the Regional Transport Plan, there being an objection from the Highway Authority, and could not be supported. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

The first of two speakers was Mr Andrew Davies on behalf of the Town Council. He contended that since temporary consent for the car park had been granted, it had proved to be a valuable asset with no adverse impact on the town. The Town Council agreed with the policy to reduce traffic within the town walls, however this car park provided easy access to the commercial centre and took traffic away from it. As in many towns, there was residents permit parking, and this was greatly oversubscribed, there being a great demand for off street parking; this car park was close to the part of the town where there were many guest houses and other accommodation providers. He noted that in its previous operation as a garage for retail and repair, the site also provided 28 privately let car parking spaces. In terms of traffic management, Mr Davies pointed out that constraints in funding had led to cut backs in transport provision and this could reduce the operation of the park and ride service, with contributions towards it already being provided by local businesses. The Council did not agree that the permanent provision of the car park would cause congestion as its existence was already signposted along South Parade, and it believed that the car park eased congestion. With regard to the site's status in the Local Development Plan, it was not currently allocated; it could be argued that its use as a car park was as important for the community as other uses and this would not prevent other uses coming forward in the future. They also considered that it was unlikely to be developed in the near future as there seemed to be little movement in bringing Tenby sites forward. They felt it would be a better use of the land to upgrade it than to allow it to become vacant.

The second speaker was Mr Giles Birt, a Chartered Surveyor living and working in the town who was representing the applicant. He noted that the impact of the car park could easily be evidenced as it had operated for six years. He pointed out that the reason for submitting a full, rather than another temporary application was the applicant's wish to further invest in the site through resurfacing and their willingness to include planting to further improve the landscaping was also stated. This would be a significant investment, in the order of £100,000, and would not be made based on a 3-year temporary consent.

Mr Birt's main comments related to the highway impact of the car park, in answer to the officers' concerns set out in the report. He stated that there had been no instances of congestion caused by the car park over the previous six years, and that in fact traffic jams resulting from cars queuing to get into the Rectory Car park had ceased. There had also been no significant under-use of existing car parks out of season, as it was shown



in their accounts that revenue had increased year on year. Mr Birt presented data from ticket sales at the Five Arches Car Park to the Committee and this showed that approximately 3000 tickets had been sold in the quietest month, January, and this consistent use of the car park all year round had proved the demand for the facility. He contended that the use of the site as a car park underpinned all the employment sites and buildings within the town by providing much needed infrastructure and had shown itself to be a valuable asset for the town, demonstrated by the support of the Town Council, Chamber of Trade & Tourism, Licensed Victuallers Association and a plethora of comments on social media. The site was also used for other community purposes such as the Iron Man event and as a location for the mobile Lloyds Bank since the local branch had closed. With regard to the criticism over the lack of coach parking at the site, he suggested that this was better provided at other, more suitable, sites within the town.

Mr Birt concluded by reiterating his belief that the site had significantly impacted on the improvement of traffic management within the town and had helped to protect the town's shopping centre for visitors and locals alike. He urged Members to take on board the view of the people and businesses who lived and worked in the town and had its future prosperity as their principle interest.

Members sought clarification regarding coach parking at the site and Mr Birt confirmed that currently none was provided as he did not believe the site was suitable. Another Member agreed that he did not believe there was a need as sufficient provision for coaches was made at the North Beach car park.

While two Members spoke in support of the officer recommendation to refuse permission, as the site provided an extremely valuable site for future development, particularly affordable housing which was needed within the town, the majority of Members were minded to approve the application. They also noted that this was a premium site and some Members doubted that local people would be able to afford any housing built on it. They also noted that people would continue to use their cars to visit Tenby and loss of this car park now would lead to additional congestion as well as looking unsightly if surrounded by hoarding. Other Members believed that the car park had been an outstanding success during the last six years and had benefitted the town economically, particularly the guest houses. It provided good disabled access and there was a huge amount of support for it in the town. The car park was also considered to be a community benefit, and they felt that it was common sense to grant permission, rather than allow the site to be left vacant with no beneficial use. They believed that the market would drive development of the site in future when this became more profitable.



With regard to alternative car parks in the town, the multi-storey was felt to be difficult for the elderly, disabled and those with young children and was often full. The park and ride had run for six and a half weeks in 2017 between 11am and 6pm, however businesses were open for more than seven hours per day.

It was suggested that another temporary consent could be a compromise, however officers noted that the applicant had specifically stated that they did not want another temporary permission, neither would this option be supported by officers.

As Members seemed minded to approve the application, the Director of Park Direction and Planning advised that she would invoke the Authority's 'Cooling Off' procedure and officers would endeavour to bring the application back to the next meeting of the Authority with a list of suitable conditions. Members provided the following reasons for approval of the application: protection of employment in the town and provision of a local facility; aids traffic management; supports the wellbeing of local businesses and residents; investment in the site would enhance the area.

**DECISION: That Members were minded to approve the application, however this was subject to the Authority's Cooling Off procedure and would be brought back to the next meeting of the Committee for a final decision.**

*[Councillor M Evans disclosed an interest in the following two applications and withdrew from the meeting while they were considered.]*

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/18/0042/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mrs J Evans  
PROPOSAL: Works to rear wing including alteration of fenestration and provision of roof lights  
LOCATION: 1 Albert View, St Julians Street, Tenby

The application was before the Committee as the applicant was related to a Member of the Authority.

It was reported that 1 Albert View was a Grade II listed flat located within the conservation area. The front sash windows apart from the bay had been replaced in standard joinery and the single storey rear wing had been modernised. Planning permission was sought for works to the rear wing including alteration of fenestration and provision of roof-lights, and replacement of two windows to the front elevation.





Officers considered that the proposed scheme was in keeping with the character of the listed building, and its setting in terms of design and form. As such it could be supported subject to conditions.

A consideration of the works comprised within the scheme requiring listed building consent was contained within the accompanying listed building application (*minute 6(h) refers*).

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans and windows and doors to be of solid timber with painted finish.**

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/18/0043/LBA  
APPLICANT: Mrs J Evans  
PROPOSAL: Works to rear wing including alteration of fenestration and provision of roof lights  
LOCATION: 1 Albert View, St Julians Street, Tenby

The application fell within the provisions of the listed building delegation Direction awarded to the Authority by the Welsh Government on 25/07/12. It was before the Committee as the applicant was related to a Member of the Authority.

It was reported that 1 Albert View was a Grade II listed flat located within the conservation area. The front sash windows apart from the bay had been replaced in standard joinery and the single storey rear wing had been modernised. Listed Building Consent was sought for works to the rear wing including alteration of fenestration and provision of roof-lights, and replacement of two windows to the front elevation.

Officers considered that the proposed scheme was in keeping with the character of the listed building, and its setting in terms of design and form. It complied with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 24 and Cadw's Conservation principles. As such it could be supported subject to conditions.

A consideration of the works comprised within the scheme requiring planning permission was contained within the accompanying planning application (*minute 6(g) refers*).

It was reported at the meeting that there was an error in the report in that Tenby Town Council had no objection to the proposal.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans and windows and doors to be of solid timber with painted finish.**



- (i) REFERENCE: NP/18/0051/OUT  
APPLICANT: Mr N James, Pembs Housing Assoc, Mill Bay Homes  
PROPOSAL: Proposed affordable housing led mixed use development comprising 38 affordable dwellings, 32 dwellings comprising shared ownership dwellings & market dwellings with an exclusivity marketing period for people with a local connection subject to demand, and a hotel (Use Class C1); including access, landscaping, drainage, car parking & associated engineering & ancillary works  
LOCATION: Land at Glasfryn Lane, St Davids

It was reported that this application sought planning permission for 38 affordable dwellings, a 63 bedroom hotel and 32 market dwellings. Two areas of open space were proposed within the residential element of the site. Access to the majority of the residential development would be via an access point off Glasfryn Lane, with 10 no. plots along the northern boundary of the site accessed via Fishguard Road. Access to the hotel would be from Glasfryn Lane via a separate access to the residential development. A restaurant was proposed within the hotel.

The application was a major development and was of significant public interest. As such, officers requested that Members consider a Committee site visit to view the site and its surroundings prior to consideration of the planning application at a subsequent Committee meeting.

**DECISION: That the Committee undertake a site inspection.**

*[Councillors M Evans and P Kidney both disclosed an interest in the following matter and withdrew from the meeting while it was considered]*

## **7. Enforcement and other Planning Matters: EC17/0082 – Land at Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier**

It was reported that planning permission had been granted by the Authority for change of use of caravan/tent park to provide 35 touring unit pitches and 15 tent pitches on 6 July 1994. It appeared to the Authority that condition 2 of this permission had not been complied with as following investigation, officers had found that more than the maximum of 35 touring caravan/tent units were on site without specific planning permission being obtained.

A Breach of Condition Notice was subsequently issued and served on the owner/applicant which required the reduction of the amount of touring caravans to 35. Details of the breach, which had not been remedied,



were set out in the report.

Members supported officers, noting that this was a flagrant breach of planning permission.

It was **RESOLVED** that authority be given to instruct solicitors to commence prosecution proceedings in the Magistrates Court for non-compliance with the Breach of Condition Notice (EC17/0082) on separate dates of 11<sup>th</sup> January 2018 and 20<sup>th</sup> February 2018 (being 2 separate counts) and for seizure of profits under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.

## **8. 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.

Three decisions were reported to the Committee. Alterations to a listed building at Medical Hall, Tenby had been dismissed, while those for change of use from A1 (retail) to A3 (hot food takeaway) at Units 1-3 South Parade Tenby and for a Slurry lagoon and silage clamps at Trewern Felindre Farchog had been allowed, with an award of costs made for the latter.

**NOTED.**

