

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

5 September 2018

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

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

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

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P Baker, Councillor M Evans and Councillor A Wilcox.

2. Disclosures of interest

There were no disclosures of interest.

3. Voting on agenda items

The Monitoring Officer advised Members that if they needed to leave the room during the meeting they should do so between items. Leaving the room during the debate would mean they would be unable to vote on that agenda item.

NOTED.

4. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 18 July 2018 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 18 July 2018 be confirmed and signed.

NOTED.

5. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 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/18/0302/FUL <i>Minute 7(a) refers</i>	Demolition of existing single storey dwelling & replacement with 2 storey dwelling, 24 Catherine Street, St Davids	Sophie Ash, Objector Andrew Vaughan-Harries, Agent

6. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The recently updated Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, outlining the purpose of the planning system and relevant considerations in decision making, the Authority's duty to carry out sustainable development, human rights considerations, the Authority's guidance to members on decision-making in committee and also set out some circumstances where costs might be awarded against the Authority on appeal.

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/18/0302/FUL
 APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs B Wood
 PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing single storey dwelling & replacement with 2 storey dwelling
 LOCATION: 24 Catherine Street, St Davids, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this site was located within the centre boundary and to the west of the St Davids Conservation Area boundary, but was not within it. It was accessed by a shared drive serving a small number of properties which were all small, detached, single storey dwellings with a similar design. The replacement dwelling would occupy a similar position within the plot to the existing dwelling, however the footprint had been enlarged and an additional storey added.

It was noted that in 2017 planning permission had been granted for a single storey rear extension to the existing dwelling together with raising of the roof by 400mm (to accommodate a loft conversion) and two rear dormers plus a rooflight.



The application was before the Committee as the views of the City Council were contrary to that of officers who considered that while the principle of a replacement dwelling was accepted in policy terms, the proposal was out of scale and visually intrusive and would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities and special qualities of the National Park, as well as an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. It was therefore recommended for refusal.

The first of two speakers was Sophie Ash who owned a neighbouring property. She believed that the dwellings in the cul-de-sac could be described as having a rural setting, a short walk from the centre of St Davids, and had been built with respect for the surrounding area and the adjacent listed 'Granary' building. She explained that she was not against the development in principle, but believed that the proposal was not in-keeping with what was there currently and would also cause overlooking. Ms Ash noted that to the front of the dwellings there was a shared drive and parking area; this was privately owned and was restricted by covenant. She feared that if the existing dwelling was replaced with a 4/5 bedroom house, there would be significant extra traffic. Also the proposed porch was forward of the existing building line. At the rear of the property she believed that there would be overlooking from the second storey into her conservatory and garden, which was currently quite private; this would have a significant effect on amenity.

Ms Ash also felt that the consultation process had been inadequate, stating that the owner of the neighbouring 'Granary' building (which was currently empty) had not been notified of the application and that the site notice had been placed 'in the bushes'. She was therefore disappointed in the process and surprised that the Authority was making this decision without talking to more neighbours.

Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries, the Agent, then addressed the Committee. He said he had been shocked when he read the recommendation of refusal as he had worked long and hard with the applicant on the scheme taking account of the setting of the building and the fall-back position (the scheme already granted consent). He considered that the existing bungalows were architecturally poor, dating from the 1970s, but were set back from the road with good screening. Consideration had been given to the question of what would be vernacular and would enhance this part of St Davids, as well as to the effect on neighbouring properties and the location of the property adjacent to a listed building and on the edge of the conservation area. The proposed replacement dwelling was positioned further away from the neighbouring property, with the majority of the glazing being located at ground floor level and dormer windows located at first floor level to the rear. A vernacular approach had been taken with a Welsh slate roof, chimney and sash windows; he believed this was



attractive and added to the quality of the street scene, not being intrusive nor having a significant impact on amenity. Statutory consultees had been supportive, notably the City Council and the Authority's Building Conservation Officer. The applicant had also received a supportive email from Councillor David Lloyd, the County Councillor for the area, which the agent read out. This expressed the view that it was fortunate that the existing dwellings were not visible from the road being obscured by shrubs and were therefore not detrimental to the area; the scale and design of the proposed dwelling, were it to be visible, would be consistent with and enhance Catherine Street. The agent concluded by saying that he felt this proposal to be a quality development, however the development could be considered to be subjective and therefore Members could benefit from a site inspection.

In response to the point raised by the objector regarding inadequate consultation, the Development Management Team Leader replied that five neighbouring properties had been consulted and a sign placed at the entrance to the cul-de-sac. A letter had been sent to The Granary and this had not been returned by Royal Mail. She also added that the Building Conservation Officer, in advising that he had no objection to the replacement dwelling, had considered its impact on the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Building, rather than on the cul-de-sac and street scene.

Members wondered whether additional overlooking would result from this application, when compared to the scheme which had already been granted planning permission and sought clarification over the position of the dormer windows and whether these could be adjusted to reduce overlooking. Officers replied that the dormer windows had been enlarged and rooflights added in the current proposal, however even if this were to be amended, the issue of scale and bulk remained. Members considered that a site inspection might prove helpful in this instance, and this was moved and seconded. It was requested that the position of the porch and the parking area could be marked on site prior to the visit.

DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow a site inspection to take place.



- (b) REFERENCE: NP/18/0370/FUL
APPLICANT: Ms H Williams
PROPOSAL: Change of use to residential curtilage (retrospective) & replacement of static caravan with building for ancillary accommodation to the house
LOCATION: Bryngwyn, Moylegrove, Cardigan

It was reported that this application site was located between two detached houses with agricultural fields to the rear. The house was a traditional stone cottage, while the large static caravan had been adjacent to the site since the 1960's and in use for periods as ancillary accommodation for the dwelling.

The application was before the Committee for consideration due to an objection from the Community Council, contrary to the officer recommendation.

Officers considered that the scale, size and design of the proposed building would not have an adverse impact on this area of the National Park. No additional landscaping was considered necessary as the site would be screened by existing hedgebanks, and it was proposed to protect this through an appropriate planning condition. It was not considered to have any adverse effect on the existing amenities of the adjacent property. If the building had been proposed as an independent form of accommodation, it would be contrary to policies of the Local Development Plan (LDP), but as ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling, and provided it was conditioned to remain as such, it was treated in the same way as an extension to the dwelling.

It was therefore concluded that the proposed building was considered to comply with all relevant policies of the LDP and was recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

It was reported at the meeting that amended plans had been received to show parking and turning areas, however these had not satisfied the objection from the Community Council. One Member asked if the Community Council could be informed of the conditions applied to any permission as he believed they were concerned to ensure the trees were protected. The officer advised that proposed condition 4 covered tree protection.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, occupation limited to purposes ancillary to the residential use of Bryngwyn, landscaping scheme and removal of the static caravan.



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/18/0413/LBA
APPLICANT: Mrs A Richards
PROPOSAL: Decorative signage on public bar frontage – retrospective
LOCATION: Bar 10, St Georges Street, Tenby

It was reported that this application fell within the provisions of the Listed Building Delegation Direction awarded to this Authority by the Welsh Government on 25 July 2012 (as amended), however it was referred to the Committee for consideration as the officer's recommendation differed to that of the Town Council.

Bar 10 operated within a Grade II listed building within the Tenby Conservation Area. The three-storey building retained medieval detail to the rear, otherwise it had been much rebuilt in the mid-C19. The façade was rendered and painted with bay windows to the first floor and sash windows above. The wide timber painted shop front had been replaced in c2003 when much of the façade was reconstructed.

Retrospective listed building consent was sought for the retention of the decorative signage on the public bar front. The design comprised a fascia background of individual pinned metal sequin-like disks and applied central numerals incorporating a logo.

The proposed scheme was considered to be in keeping with the character of the listed building, and its setting in terms of design and form. It was also considered to be appropriate in terms of size, scale and detail and therefore complied with the requirement of TAN 24 and Cadw's conservation principles. As such the application could be supported subject to conditions.

It was reported at the meeting that since writing the report that Tenby Civic Society had responded in support of the application.

One Member commented that he believed the signage to be in-keeping and enhanced the building.

DECISION: That listed building consent be granted subject to a condition relating to accordance with plans.

7. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 5 appeals (against planning decisions made by the Authority) that were currently lodged with the Welsh Government, and detailed which stage of the appeal process had been reached to date in every case.



A decision notice was appended relating to The Mill, Sandy Haven which was dismissed.

The Development Management Team Leader apologised that the address had been omitted from the report for NP/17/0551/S73 and advised that this related to Whitewell Caravan Park, Penally. She added that the hearing into that appeal had been held the previous day, with a decision expected before the end of the month. She added that the appeal Inquiry relating to Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier would take place on 6 November 2018, and it would be useful if some Members were able to attend; however it was noted that this date clashed with the Designated Landscapes Members' Seminar which was being hosted by the Authority on the 5th and 6th November.

NOTED.

