

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

25 April 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, Dr R Heath-Davies, Councillor M James, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor PJ Morgan, Dr RM Plummer, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 11.35am]

1. Apologies

There were apologies for absence from Mrs G Hayward and Mrs J James.

2. Disclosures of interest

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

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minute 7(b)below</i> <i>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

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 14 March and 26 March 2018 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was noted that there was a typographical error in the Welsh version of the minutes of 14 March. The second paragraph on page 7 should have read “Roedd cyflwyno mesurau ac effeithiau a fyddai'n fras yn cyfateb i Ffordd Dawel”.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 14 March and 26 March 2018 be confirmed and signed subject to the above amendment.



4. Chair's Announcement

The Chair announced that it was likely that the next meeting of the Committee would be held in St Davids due to the considerable interest shown in the application for housing and a hotel at Glasfryn Lane, St Davids recently visited by Members, and the significance of this development to the City.

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

Reference number	Proposal	Speaker
NP/17/0283/FUL <i>Minute 7(a) refers, Land at Station Road, Manorbier, Tenby</i>	Proposed erection of 23 affordable homes with associated access, parking, landscaping & engineering works	Mr Hughes, Manorbier Community Council Mr Sam Stalbow, applicant
NP/17/0714/FUL <i>Minute 7(d) refers, Bank House, 11 Ffordd yr Afon, Trefin, Haverfordwest</i>	Demolition of existing structures and provide 3 new 3 storey 4 bedroom detached dwellings with associated external works	Helen Bowen, Objector Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries, Agent
NP/18/0108/FUL <i>Minute 7(e) refers, Land at Prendergast, Solva</i>	Construction of timber footbridge, masonry abutments, steps & access to minor road	Anthony Richards, PCNPA, 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 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

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*):

- (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

Members were reminded that at the previous meeting of the Committee, they had deferred this application to allow a site visit to take place, and the minutes of the Site Inspection Committee had been considered earlier in the meeting (*Minute 3 refers*).

Officers reiterated their original conclusion 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. They therefore recommended that the application be delegated to officers to grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement requiring no less than 50% of the dwellings built on the site to be built and retained as affordable housing and to conditions as set out in the report.

There were two speakers, the first was Mr Hughes, Chairman of Manorbier Community Council. He explained that the Council was deeply



concerned regarding road safety, as the site was opposite the school. The area was particularly congested at school drop-off and pick-up times as there was no car park, only a small parking bay. The road was busy, serving caravan parks and the train station, in addition to being used by large lorries avoiding a railway bridge. He stated that the Local Development Plan (LDP) allocation was for a mixed development, however the current application was only for residential development. He also pointed out that there were two other large scale allocations in the area – one for 16 units less than 200 yards away and the other on the outskirts of Jameston. If all were built upon, this would mean that 50 new dwellings would be built in the area; the Community Council felt that this would unbalance what was a small rural area. It was pointed out that the Inspector had acknowledged that the impact of the site would be significant but not unacceptable, however Mr Hughes questioned whether it was still acceptable if all three developments were taken together.

The second speaker was Mr Sam Stalbow from Pembrokeshire Housing Association (recently renamed ateb). He explained that he did not wish to speak, however he was happy to answer any questions Members had, which he proceeded to do. With regard to the pumping station, he explained that the current application included provision of a pumping station, however work was ongoing to trace a rising main that ran through the site. As this already served more than one curtilage the asset transferred to Welsh Water and the proposed development could make use of the existing pumping station, instead of building a new one on the site.

Mr Stalbow was then asked which settlement the proposed development would be closest to, and he replied that both Manorbier and Jameston were equidistant, however Jameston would be closer by the main road. Another Member asked about the demand for affordable housing in the area, how the site would be marketed and allocations made, and Mr Stalbow replied that housing need figures for the immediate and surrounding areas were provided by the Local Housing Authority and the dwelling type and mix to be built on a site were based on the demand identified. The Association operated a local lettings policy under which people in the local vicinity were offered housing first, with a tiered approach being used if there was insufficient demand. However the existing need would be targeted and only the number of houses required would be built.

He confirmed that the development was viable, the necessary assessments having taken place prior to submitting the application. With regard to concerns regarding traffic outside the school, Mr Stalbow explained that the development provided for two parking spaces per dwelling in addition to visitor parking, and this should mean that no



additional cars would be parked on the main or estate road. He added that this would allow for the likely over-spill parking that occurred in the vicinity of most schools at peak times. He also noted that the advice of the Highway Authority had been sought at the pre-planning stage and they had been consulted on the planning application; they had provided no negative feedback. The planning officer confirmed that Highways had recommended conditional consent. When asked about the turnover of houses on the Housing Association development at the nearby village of St Florence, Mr Stalbow explained that this was outside of his area of work, which was development of sites.

Members then proceeded to debate the application.

One Member expressed his opposition to the application which he did not believe was related to either Manorbier or Jameston. He did not believe that public transport in the area was either affordable or convenient and therefore if residents used cars, the additional traffic would add to the congestion outside the school. He noted that the road was already busy and if the road at Beavers Halt was closed as many were calling for because of safety reasons, this road past the school would be the main way for large lorries to gain access to The Ridgeway avoiding the railway bridge. He also did not believe that the development would increase the number of children attending the school and thus sustain it into the future as children moving into the housing would remain at their existing schools. He felt that the impact of the development on the area was too great and that more weight should be given to the views of the Community Council in this instance.

Other Members agreed that the site was not well located and while they acknowledged that affordable housing was needed, they did not believe that this application should be for affordable housing only or that three developments totalling some 100 houses should be allowed in such a small community. Officers pointed out that the members had to decide upon the application before them.

Concerns were also expressed about the removal of trees which were the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. Officers replied that the Tree and Landscape Officer had been consulted on the application and had recommended conditional consent.

However other Members pointed out that the land was sited in a local centre which was accessible and had a range of services and facilities. There was a duty to determine applications in accordance with the Local Development Plan, and given that the site was allocated for housing within it and had been approved and formally adopted by the Authority, Members needed strong reasons to go against this presumption in favour



of development. The need for affordable housing in the area had also been demonstrated. While concerns had been raised, some of these could be addressed through conditions and other mitigating measures suggested by the applicant.

The recommendation of delegation to officers to approve the application subject to the Section 106 agreement and other conditions as set out in the report was moved and seconded. The vote on this motion resulted in 7 votes in favour and 7 against, with 1 abstention. The Chairman's casting vote was against and therefore the motion to approve was lost.

The Director of Park Direction and Planning noted that this was a significant departure from adopted planning policy and invoked the Authority's 'Cooling Off' Procedure and in accordance with it asked Members to provide planning reasons for going against the officer recommendation. Those provided were: that the development was not related to a settlement; over-development; road safety with concerns over traffic congestion on a corner plot and an inappropriate mix of affordable/market housing.

DECISION: That Members were minded to refuse the application for the reasons provided, i.e. that that the development was not related to a settlement; over-development; road safety with concerns over traffic congestion on a corner plot and an inappropriate mix of affordable/market housing, however as the Authority's "Cooling Off" procedure had been invoked the application would be brought back to the next meeting of the Committee for a final decision.

[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]

- (b) 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

Members were reminded that this application for the sub-division of the garden of Velfrey Cottage to form a plot for a new two storey three bedroomed residential dwelling had been deferred at the previous meeting of the Committee to allow a site visit to take place (Minute 3 refers).

It was reported that 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.

At the meeting, the Planning Officer reported that further correspondence had been received from the Highway Authority which explained that an application for a licence to maintain or repair the boundary wall could be submitted to them at any time and narrowing of the highway at this location was therefore a separate issue to the planning application. The conclusion therefore remained that, 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.

Thanking officers for what had been a helpful site visit, a number of Members remained concerned about the size, mass and shape of the development, particularly in relation to its location within the Conservation Area and proximity to the carriageway. They considered the dwelling to be too large and narrowing of the carriageway which formed part of the village's one-way system remained of concern.

Other Members, however, were reassured by the work that the applicant had undertaken with officers to redesign the original proposal, modifying those aspects that had caused concern.

A motion to refuse the application was proposed and seconded, however this vote was lost.

A vote was then taken on a substantive proposal to approve the application subject to conditions and this was won.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, surface water drainage, ecological mitigation, approval of sample stonework, landscaping scheme, designated window to be of obscure glazing and submission of a Construction Management Plan.



- (c) 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

Members were reminded that this application had been considered by the Committee on 14 March 2018 when Members were minded to approve the application contrary to national and local policy. In view of this, the Authority's 'Cooling Off' procedure was invoked by the Director of Park Direction and Planning which required the application to be re-considered at the next meeting of the Committee.

Officers had concluded that there was a lack of 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. Notwithstanding the recommendation, draft conditions were proposed should Members be minded to approve the application.

Several Members reiterated their support for the scheme as visitor numbers over Easter had demonstrated a lack of parking in the town. The proximity of the car park to the centre was particularly helpful to the elderly, disabled and those with young children and it therefore supported the social and economic wellbeing of the town. A motion to approve the application subject to the suggested conditions was proposed and seconded and as a result of the 'Cooling-off' procedure, a recorded vote was taken as follows:

For: Councillor P Baker, Councillor Mrs D Clements, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor M Evans, Councillor P Harries, Dr R Heath-Davies, Councillor M James, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Dr RM Plummer, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland.



Against: Mr A Archer

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to accordance with plans, landscaping scheme, lighting and no overnight sleeping.

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/17/0714/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr R Gambold
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing structures and provide 3 new 3 storey 4 bedroom detached dwellings with associated external works
LOCATION: Bank House, 11 Ffordd Yr Afon, Trefin

Planning approval was sought for the development of three residential properties and associated external works. The dwellings would have a two-storey form when viewed from the north and three storey form when viewed from the south due to the sloping topography of the site. Access to the site would be provided through the existing residential estate of Cefn Gallod and then through a section of the existing boundary hedge bank. Llanrhian Community Council had objected to the application and because this was contrary to the officer recommendation, the application was before the Committee.

The officer pointed out a typographical error at the top of page 103 – 4, rather than 18, dwellings could be accommodated on the site using a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. It was also noted that since writing the report, copies of the S106 Agreements had been received from the applicant.

In conclusion, following consideration of the policies contained in local and national planning policy, and having regard to all material considerations, the development was considered to provide new residential properties while sustaining the local character. As such, and subject to a schedule of conditions and legal agreements, the development was acceptable and the recommendation was one of delegation to officers to grant planning permission.

While Llanrhian Community Council had indicated their wish to speak at the Committee, there was no representative present to do so. The first speaker was therefore Helen Bowen, an objector who said she was representing the views of those living in Cefn Gallod. She stated that with regard to landscaping and biodiversity the trees at Bank House were referred to in Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Local Development Plan (LDP) as being of importance, and thus the removal of mature trees would be detrimental. She believed that the development failed to enhance the landscape and would in fact compromise the



adjoining recreation area which provided the village's only area of open space. Turning to affordable housing, Ms Bowen noted that the aim of the LDP in rural centres was to meet housing need, however as she did not believe there was a shortage of market housing in the village, the proposed development would lead to an increase in house prices and potential for second/holiday homes which would compound, rather than alleviate the situation. She did not believe that the provision of a commuted sum would benefit the Community Council as there was a lack of land on which housing could be built. Finally, the amenity of adjacent dwellings would be adversely affected due to the impact of traffic generation from the development. She feared that the safety of children would be compromised as the small residential street through which access would be gained was already overcrowded with cars. She stated that these concerns were also shared by the wider community.

The second speaker was Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries, who was acting as a representative for the applicant, Mr Richard Gambold who was away on business. He explained that due to the sensitive location of the site, his client had received advice from the Design Commission for Wales in order to achieve a high quality design which drew on a broad range of sources, some vernacular and some contemporary. He had also worked with officers to address their concerns. Mr Vaughan-Harries did not believe that the development was visually intrusive and although there would inevitably be disturbance to local residents during construction and a loss of trees, he noted that the site had previously been granted planning permission. He went on to state that his client had attended a meeting of the Community Council when planning permission had initially been sought, and they had no adverse comments on the scheme at that time. With regard to safety, the Highway Authority had recommended conditional consent and a substantial monetary contribution would be made towards affordable housing – noting that some housing had recently been constructed nearby, but outside of the National Park. The Planning Officer clarified for Members that the contribution would be in the region of £100,000.

Some Members expressed concerned regarding the more modern elements of the proposed design, such as the zinc roofs. Officers replied that there were examples of this material in the locality and noted that while the rear elevations were more modern and innovative, the front of the properties were more traditional in design. The houses were also designed to Passivhaus standard which was to be commended. With regard to impact on amenity, separation distances and orientation were acceptable.

A motion to undertake a site inspection was proposed and seconded, however this was lost. The recommendation of delegation to officers to



grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of S106 Agreements was then moved and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning/Team Leader to grant planning permission subject to completion of S106 Agreements in respect of the provision of affordable housing and planning obligations within 3 months of this meeting. The planning permission would also be subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, surface water drainage, landscaping scheme, construction phase traffic management plan, parking and archaeology.

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/18/0108/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr A Richards, Access Manager, PCNPA
PROPOSAL: Construction of timber footbridge, masonry abutments, steps & access to minor road
LOCATION: Land at Prendergast, Solva, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as it was made on behalf of the National Park Authority.

The site formed a small area of land covering both banks of the River Solva. At present there was no footpath linkage at this location and approval was sought for a new link from Prendergast Woods to Prendergast Road via a new foot bridge and associated stepped access.

Officers concluded that following consideration of the policies contained in local and national planning policy, and having regard to all material considerations, the development would be in keeping with the aims of the Local Development Plan as it provided a new footpath link via a new timber foot bridge while sustaining the local character. The proposal also had support from the Authority's Buildings Conservation Officer and Transportation and Environment Section at Pembrokeshire County Council. It was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The applicant, Mr Anthony Richards, then addressed the Committee explaining that the bridge was crucial to the provision of a new circuit walk in Solva as there was currently no link to the network of well used footpaths which existed on both sides of the river. Provision of the link would increase usage, and the walk would be promoted on the Authority's website. The location of the structure meant that it had been necessary to obtain a Flood Risk Activity Permit which had influenced its design so that the flow of water would not be impeded. The consent of landowners had been obtained and officers had delegated authority to create the right of way. Funding for the structure was in place through an external grant



for provision of materials and maintenance would be absorbed into the current regime. He concluded that provision of a bridge at this location would benefit the health and wellbeing of the people of Solva and improve the tourist offer. It accorded with the aims of the Authority's Corporate Plan and the objectives of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

Members asked why that particular location had been chosen for a bridge, and the officer replied that the landowner had been willing, and there were good visibility sight lines when accessing the adjacent road – this would be via a self-closing gate for safety reasons. They also asked why steps, rather than a ramp, were provided and it was explained that this was due to conditions of the Flood Risk Permit. It was hoped that local stone, rather than Blue Pennant, would be used for the bridge abutments and the officer agreed that it would.

DECISION: That the Application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, landscaping scheme and recommendations of the Otter Survey Report.

8. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 3 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.

