

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

5 December 2018

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)
Mr A Archer, Councillor P Baker, Councillor Mrs D Clements,
Councillor M Evans, Councillor P Harries, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs J
James, Councillor M James, Councillor PJ Morgan, Dr RM Plummer,
Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor S Yelland.

(Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 12.30pm)

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor K Doolin, Mrs G Hayward, Councillor P Kidney and Councillor M Williams.

2. Disclosures of interest

Councillor M Evans disclosed a personal and prejudicial interest in the following planning application and withdrew from the meeting while the proposal was being considered:

NP/18/0335/FUL – Alterations to provide new access to the site, increase site area and change existing 50 static caravans, 20 touring caravans and 30 tents into 91 lodge-style static caravans, new shop and reception area, new tractor shed, sales/display area for 2 units, staff and visitor parking area, new restaurant, areas for LPG storage and electricity transformer, minor alterations to existing road layout together with provision of new access roads within the site and associated external works – Fishguard Bay Camping and Caravan Park, Fishguard.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 17 October 2018 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 17 October 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 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/18/0335/FUL <i>Minute 6(d) refers</i>	Alterations to provide new access to the site, increase site area and change existing 50 static caravans, 20 touring caravans and 30 tents into 91 lodge-style static caravans, new shop and reception area, new tractor shed, sales/display area for 2 units, staff and visitor parking area, new restaurant, areas for LPG storage and electricity transformer, minor alterations to existing road layout together with provision of new access roads within the site and associated external works – Fishguard Bay Camping and Caravan Park, Fishguard	County Councillor R Kilmister – Supporter; Mr Phil Davies – Agent (<i>although Mr Davies had requested to address the Committee, he was not present at the meeting</i>)
NP/18/0396/OUT <i>Minute 6(e) refers</i>	Residential development – 14 dwellings – Land off Trewarren Road, St Ishmaels, Haverfordwest	Mrs Linda Jones – Agent
NP/18/0488/OUT <i>Minute 6(g) refers</i>	Proposed planning (outline) for 11 residential units in total with 9 no. 4/5 bed full market dwellings and 2 no. affordable dwellings – Land off Nun Street & East of Ysgol Dewi Primary School, St Davids	Mrs Elisabeth Wheatley – Objector; Mr A Vaughan-Harries - Agent

5. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The 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.

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/18/0051/OUT
APPLICANT: Mr N James, Pembrokeshire Housing Association, Mill Bay Homes Ltd & Swangate Development Ltd & Premier Inn Hotels
PROPOSAL: 38 Affordable residential dwellings, Hotel, 32 open market dwellings & associated car parking, access, landscaping, drainage & engineering works
LOCATION: Land at Glasfryn Road, St Davids

Members were reminded that, at the Development Management Committee meeting held on the 6th June 2018, they resolved to authorise officers to approve the above-mentioned application, subject to a S106 Agreement and an acceptable Appropriate Assessment. It had been further resolved at the meeting that failure to complete the legal agreements within six months of that date would allow officers to use their discretion to refuse the application.

The Development Management Team Leader reported that the specialised and technical character of the information required for the Appropriate Assessment had resulted in a delay in the submission of the information required; a revised drainage strategy had also been required and this was currently being considered by Natural Resources Wales. She went on to say that the final draft of the S106 Agreement was being prepared and she consequently asked Members for an extension to the 6-month time limit to the 18th January 2019 to allow for any unforeseen additional information and/or further consideration which might be required.

DECISION: That the deadline for completion of the S106 Agreement and an acceptable Appropriate Assessment for application NP/18/0051/OUT be extended from the 6th December 2018, as



previously resolved by Committee on the 6th June 2018, to the 18th January 2019.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/18/0326/FUL
APPLICANT: Ms G Young, Parking Eye Ltd
PROPOSAL: Erection of car park management camera column & associated electrical cabinet
LOCATION: Grove Hotel, 51 High Street, St Davids, Haverfordwest

It was reported that the application was before the Committee for consideration as the views of St Davids City Council were contrary to the officer's recommendation for refusal.

The Case Officer stated that the applicant proposed to install an actual number plate recognition (ANPR) car park management system in the grounds of the Grade II Listed Grove Hotel. It was proposed to install a 5 metre high lighting column with a camera mounted on the top, abutting the walls of the walled garden, which was also Grade II Listed. Discussions had been held with the applicant about installing the camera at other, lower locations in the grounds, but these had been rejected by the applicant.

While the County Council's Transportation and Environment department had no objection, and St Davids City Council supported the application, the Case Officer and the Authority's Building Conservation Officer considered the proposal in its present form to be inappropriate due to the sensitive location in relation to its Grade II Listed surroundings. It was recommended that the application be refused for the reason set out in the report before Members that day.

Members agreed that the proposal was unacceptable as it would be a very prominent and visually intrusive feature within the grounds of a listed building and at the gateway of the St Davids Conservation Area. They commended the Case Officer for engaging with the applicant in an effort to reach a more satisfactory proposal.

DECISION: That the application be refused as the proposed development was insensitively and unsympathetically designed and, by reason of its prominent siting and proximity to the Grove Hotel and Walled Garden, which were Grade II Listed structures, would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II Listed buildings.



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/18/0327/ADV
APPLICANT: Ms G Young, Parking Eye Ltd
PROPOSAL: Erection of car park management signage
LOCATION: Grove Hotel, 51 High Street, St Davids

It was reported that the above-mentioned application had been submitted in tandem with planning application NP/18/0326/FUL (Minute 6(b) above refers) and sought advertisement consent for the erection of 6 no. individual signs within the grounds of the Grade II Listed Grove Hotel. The Case Officer reported that she had been in discussion with the applicant and, despite the fact that the number of signs proposed had been reduced from 9 pole-mounted signs to 6 lower level structures, the proposal was still considered unacceptable in terms of numbers, design and adverse impact on their surroundings.

DECISION: That the application be refused on numbers, design and siting terms as the signs would have an adverse impact on amenity and their prominent siting in proximity to the Grade II Listed Grove Hotel and Walled Garden.

(Councillor M Evans disclosed a personal and prejudicial interest in the following planning application and withdrew from the meeting whilst it was being discussed.)

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/18/0335/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr M Whitehouse
PROPOSAL: Alterations to provide new access to the site, increase site area & change existing 50 static caravans, 20 touring caravans and 30 tents into 91 lodge-style static caravans, new shop & reception area, new tractor shed, sales/display area for 2 units, staff & visitor parking area, new restaurant, areas for LPG storage and electricity transformer, minor alterations to existing road layout together with provision of new access roads within the site and associated external works
LOCATION: Fishguard Bay Camping & Caravan Park, Fishguard

It was reported that the above-mentioned application was being reported to Committee for consideration as it was classed as a major development.

The 2.75 hectare site was located on the coastal slopes overlooking Fishguard Bay and currently had planning consent for 50 static caravans, 20 touring caravans and 30 tents interspersed throughout. A main reception building accommodated other associated facilities for the site and, directly on the northern coastal edge lay two further buildings, which



accommodated holiday-let units and a storage area. The site was reached via an unclassified road off the Trunk Road A487.

Planning consent was sought for alterations to provide a new access and to increase the site area in order to accommodate 91 lodge-style static caravans instead of the current mix of accommodation. The proposal also included a new shop and reception area, tractor shed and restaurant, along with other various facilities/services.

The Case Officer raised a number of concerns in relation to visual amenity, privacy, landscaping, biodiversity, highway safety and access, land drainage and flooding. He acknowledged the economic considerations put forward by the supporting tourism impact assessment in relation to staffing and job creation, however he was of the view that the significant impact of the development on the National Park landscape and its special qualities outweighed these considerations. The landscaping scheme put forward was also insufficient and would result in a significant adverse change to the coastal splendour, remoteness, tranquillity and wilderness of this particular stretch of coastline. He was also concerned about the loss of flora and fauna resulting from the enlargement of the site and its associated groundworks. The applicant had offered to restore some of the application site to natural habitat in mitigation for the scheme, but it was considered it would be difficult to manage and maintain due to its location within the site.

He added that the National Trust had objected and submitted in support a report from an expert landscape consultant, which raised similar concerns to those identified by the Case Officer and pointed out that no landscape and visual assessment had been submitted with the application, despite it being in such a highly sensitive nationally protected landscape. The National Trust's consultant also referred to the significant adverse impact the development would have on the setting of the Trust's adjoining land, and the visual intrusion it would cause when viewed from the Trust's land farther along the coast. The consultant's report was circulated at the meeting.

The Case Officer went on to say that the West Wales Trunk Road Agency had been consulted and had responded that a traffic impact statement was required before any planning consent could be granted. However, such a statement had not been requested of the applicant as the Case Officer recommended that there were additional reasons for the application to be refused.

The County Council's Public Protection department considered that the development would not generate a significant impact on residential properties in the area, while Dinas Cross Community Council supported



the application. Natural Resources Wales were concerned that no landscape and visual assessment had been submitted with the proposal and considered that the current proposal failed to demonstrate that it would not have an adverse impact on the landscape and special qualities of the National Park.

The Case Officer concluded by recommending that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report before Members that day, coupled with the following additional reasons:

- Insufficient traffic management information
- Lack of landscape and visual assessment
- Adverse impact on the ecological habitat of the site.

County Councillor R Kilmister addressed the Committee and asked the Members to visit the site before coming to a decision as he considered that photographs and plans were not sufficient in this instance. He acknowledged that the proposed development was no doubt a departure from the Local Development Plan; however he believed the economic considerations to be overwhelming in this case. The local area was struggling and the proposed marina development in nearby Fishguard had been scrapped within the previous 12 months. This development would create 21 full-time posts and be a much-needed boost to the local economy. He added that there was a large number of second homes in the area and this proposal would provide potential second home owners with an alternative option.

He went on to say that the site was once a military base in the 1940s and was most visible from the sea and from Goodwick. It had always been an extremely prominent site, but the new owners had been replacing the previous white static caravans with lodges, which had significantly reduced the visual impact. He considered that, although the proposed development would make the site larger, it would be less prominent on the eye.

In conclusion, he agreed that granting planning consent would be a departure from the Local Development Plan, but he considered that the following material planning considerations outweighed the objections put forward by the Case Officer:

- The social and economic effect on the area as it would lower the pressure on second homes
- The site would be improved and would, therefore, enhance the National Park
- He disagreed with the third reason for refusal in the Case Officer's report stating that insufficient information had been submitted in



respect of highway repairs and improvements in the form of a legal agreement. He stated that the applicant would be prepared to enter into a legal agreement in this regard.

Councillor Kilmister concluded by asking the Committee to undertake a site inspection before reaching a decision on the application.

In response to the third point (above) raised by Councillor Kilmister, the Case Officer replied that the request for a legal agreement had not been put to the applicant as the application was recommended for refusal.

DECISION: That consideration of the application be deferred and the site inspected by the Committee.

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/18/0396/OUT
APPLICANT: Mr Marshall & Mr Warren-Davis
PROPOSAL: Residential development – 14 dwellings
LOCATION: Land off Trewarren Road, St Ishmaels, Haverfordwest

It was reported that a previous planning application for 27 dwellings on this site had been refused as the applicant would not enter into a S106 Agreement to allow the Authority to reassess the viability of the scheme at reserved matters stage. The decision was appealed against and, while the Planning Inspector considered the proposed layout and access arrangements to be acceptable and the development to be in accordance with the Local Development Plan, he agreed with the Authority's approach and dismissed the appeal.

The current proposal sought outline permission for four affordable houses and ten open market houses, with all matters, other than access and layout, reserved for future consideration. The development would comprise a mix of 4-, 3- and 2-bed two storey and single storey dwellings. The Case Officer considered the proposal to be acceptable, subject to conditions and to the completion of a S106 Agreement in respect of the following heads of terms:

- 4 affordable units to be provided on site, including the timing of their completion
- Planning obligations (provision of cycle facilities)
- Wildlife conservation area management scheme

However, concerns had been raised by St Ishmaels Community Council and local residents in relation to viability of the scheme, the loss of hedge-bank, ecological impact, impact of the development during construction phase, visual impact and highway safety at the school and off-street



parking problem. The Case Officer had addressed the objections raised in her report before Members that day.

Mrs Linda Jones, the Agent for the development, addressed the Committee, stating that the number of units proposed by the present application had been reduced from 27 to 14 in accordance with advice from Dŵr Cymru but the possibility for another 13 dwellings on an adjacent site in future remained.

She stated that the layout had been simplified in that the length of roads had been reduced and now went with the contours of the site; this was also true of the siting of the dwellings. She added that the road layout did not preclude access to the possible future development of 13 dwellings, subject to the sewage capacity and the land in question being included in the new Local Development Plan.

She went on to say that an ecological assessment of the site had been undertaken in 2014, which was re-assessed in 2017. The current proposal minimised the impact on wildlife and included a wildlife area on the site.

Councillor R Owens asked whether it would be possible to access the application site through adjoining land that had already been granted planning permission for housing development. This would result in the hedgerow remaining intact instead of being removed for access purposes. Mrs Jones replied that doing so would mean that development of this site would be restricted until such time as the access road for the first development had been completed, therefore this was not an option.

In response to questions from Members, Mrs Jones replied that the four affordable houses would be developed first, and that access on to the side lane was not an option due to the narrowness of the lane. She added that the County Council's Highways department were happy with the proposed access. She referred to the fact that the access had been designed to give a semi-rural feel to the site with a wildlife area to one side.

Members commended the Case Officer and the Agent on bringing forward a deliverable and excellent scheme on what was a challenging site. They asked the Case Officer to bring back a report to Members on how the development proceeded so that lessons could be learned from the process.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning/Team Leader to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report before



Members that day and subject to a S106 Agreement relating to the building of the four affordable units, planning obligations (provision of cycle facilities) and a wildlife conservation area management scheme. The S106 Agreement to be completed within three months of the date of the meeting and, if not completed within this timeframe, officers would be authorised to use their discretion to refuse the application under delegation procedures as the proposal would be contrary to policies 11, 44, 45, 52 and 53 of the Local Development Plan.

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/18/0402/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr R Ashley
PROPOSAL: Construction of garage for private use
LOCATION: Freshwater Inn, Jason Road, Freshwater East, Pembroke

It was reported that the above-mentioned application had been withdrawn.

NOTED.

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/18/0488/OUT
APPLICANT: Messrs Pert & Holmes
PROPOSAL: Proposed planning (outline) for 11 residential units in total with 9 no. 4/5 bed full market dwellings and 2 no. affordable dwellings
LOCATION: Land off Nun Street & east of Ysgol Dewi Primary School, St Davids

It was reported that the above-mentioned application was being reported to Committee for consideration as it was classed as a major development.

The proposal was for planning approval in outline, with all matters reserved for future consideration, for the development of 11 residential units with nine open market units and two affordable units. Access to the site would be off Nun Street.

The Case Officer referred to his report which was before Members that day, in which he set out the key issues considered and his assessment of those issues. The site was included in the current Local Development Plan as an allocated site for 10 residential housing units and, while the proposal was for one additional unit, the density still fell below the required density for sites within a defined Local Centre (Policy 44 of the Local Development Plan refers).

The report also set out the responses received from statutory consultees and eighteen public responses, which raised concerns/objections relating



to scale, amenity, privacy, over-development, landscape, ecological and traffic impact, design and impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings.

In conclusion, and following consideration of the policies contained within the Local Development Plan and Planning Policy Wales, and having regard to all material planning considerations, the Case Officer recommended that the application be delegated to officers to grant outline planning permission, subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 Agreement in respect of the provision of affordable housing and planning obligations.

Mr A Vaughan-Harries, the Agent, addressed the Committee, stating that he was disappointed at the number of objections raised to the development. He referred to the fact that the site had been allocated for residential development in the Local Development Plan since 2010, albeit for 10 properties. He stated that the proposal was viable although, due to market pressures, the percentage of affordable housing had been reduced from 50% to 15%. His clients were required to invest £54,000 to upgrade the sewage capacity and water supply and were happy to include this in the S106 Agreement. He concluded by saying that it had been a pleasure to work with the Case Officer on this proposal.

In response to a question from Members, Mr Vaughan-Harries replied that there was a strong hedge between the application site and the school boundary and, although landscaping matters had been reserved for a future application, he hoped that the screening would remain.

Mrs Wheatley then addressed the Committee. She lived in Nun Street in a Listed property and opposed the application. She stated that an application for development had been refused in 1989 as it would close the last remaining gap in Nun Street and obscure the dramatic views. She considered that development on this site would detract from the character of the area. She stated that she had no objection to development in St Davids but there were other sites more capable and appropriate than this.

She went on to say that it would result in visual intrusion and damage to the unique environment of the Conservation Area and would damage the last hedgerow in St Davids. She and other residents of Nun Street were also concerned about over-development of the site, lack of privacy, overshadowing, the inadequacy of the current sewage system and the fact that the view from their properties would be obscured.

In response to comments from Members regarding the design of the site, the Case Officer stated that the layout and design were only indicative at this stage and would be controlled under reserved matters. However,



based on the indicative layout submitted, privacy issues would be satisfied.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning/Team Leader to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report before Members that day and subject to a S106 Agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing and planning obligations. The S106 Agreement to be completed within three months of the date of the meeting and, if not completed within this timeframe, officers would be authorised to refuse the application on lack of information under delegated procedures.

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/18/0548/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr I Wilkinson
PROPOSAL: Partial conversion of public house to a 2 bedroom flat
LOCATION: Temple Bar, Amroth, Narberth

It was reported that the above-mentioned application was being reported to Committee for consideration as the views of Amroth Community Council were contrary to the Case Officer's recommendation of refusal.

The Case Officer stated that the application site was a two-storey building of relatively modern appearance in a prominent location overlooking Amroth beach. The existing building was semi-detached and comprised two existing businesses at ground floor level with the Temple Bar and Smugglers Retreat. At first floor level were two residential accommodation units which were accessed from the rear of the building via a separate stairwell. Planning approval was sought for the partial conversion of the existing public house known as Temple Bar into a two-bedroom ground floor residential unit, which would be located at the rear of the existing building and have access off the rear car park area.

The report before Members that day considered the key issues involved, including visual amenity, privacy, siting, highway safety, etc. While the proposal would have no additional impact on the character of the existing building, locality and neighbouring properties, the Case Officer considered there were significant national and local policy objections to the location of the property as it was adjacent to an existing flood risk zone and, in his opinion, the proposal would intensify a highly vulnerable use within that zone. Taking into consideration the policy for Amroth in the current Shoreline Management Plan and the lifespan of the application site, he considered that the potential risk for flooding would only increase over time and he recommended that the application be refused for the reason set out in his report.



Both Councillor M Evans and Mr T Sangster fully supported the proposal as it would, in their opinion, enable the business to continue to trade. Mr Sangster added that the applicant was aware of the possible flooding implications and could take mitigating measures to prevent it from occurring. He did not consider it logical to determine the application on criteria that might change in 50-60 years' time. Other Members, however, were concerned about the potential flooding issues and, taking into consideration the lifespan of the property, agreed with the Case Officer's recommendation.

DECISION: That the application be refused as the site was adjacent to the boundary of a Flood Zone C2 and was therefore contrary to advice contained within Welsh Government Planning Policy Wales, Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk and Policy 34 (Flooding and Coastal Inundation) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Plan.

[The meeting was adjourned at 11.45a.m. and recommenced at 11.55a.m.]

- (i) REFERENCE: NP/18/0575/OUT
APPLICANT: Mr G Davies, GRD Ltd
PROPOSAL: Outline application for 18 affordable houses and 40 open market dwellings and associated landscaping
LOCATION: Land to the west and east of Glasfryn Road, St Davids

The above-mentioned application was being reported to the Committee as it was classed as major development.

It was reported that outline planning permission was sought with all matters reserved other than access for 18 no. affordable dwellings and 40 no. open market dwellings. An indicative plan had been provided by the applicant, but this was extremely indicative and probably liable to change should planning consent be granted.

The Case Officer stated that four letters of objection had been received together with an emailed objection from a local resident, who had requested that his objections be circulated to Members that day. The key issues had all been considered, an analysis of which was contained in the report before Members that day. Following consideration of the relevant planning policies, and having regard to all material considerations, it was considered that the proposal was in keeping with the aims of the Pembrokeshire Coast Local Development Plan in that the development would provide new residential properties while sustaining the local character of the National Park and not adversely impacting upon ecology or highway safety. As such, and subject to S106 Agreements and a



schedule of suitable conditions, it was recommended that the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning/Team Leader to grant planning permission. She went on to say that the completed S106 Agreements would be required within 3 months of the date of the meeting and, if not completed within this timeframe, officers would be able to use their discretion to refuse the application under delegation procedures as the proposal would be contrary to policies 11, 45 and 48.

Members supported the principle of development but hoped that the developer would submit a more appropriate design than the indicative plan currently submitted. The Case Officer assured Members that this would be dealt with when an application was submitted under approval of reserved matters.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning/Team Leader to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report before Members that day and subject to relevant S106 Agreements. The S106 Agreements to be completed within three months of the date of the meeting and, if not completed within this timeframe, officers would be authorised to refuse the application under delegated procedures.

- (j) REFERENCE: NP/18/0675/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr A Muskett
PROPOSAL: Road widening to create a passing bay and road edge barrier
LOCATION: Castell Henllys Iron Age Fort, Felindre Farchog, Crymych

It was reported that the above-mentioned application was being considered by Members as it had been submitted by the Authority. The application sought planning permission for the widening of the access road within the boundary of the Castell Henllys site to create a single passing bay on the narrow land and to install a road edge barrier to prevent vehicles from falling off the road into the valley.

The consultation period was still live therefore some responses were still awaited. It was, therefore, recommended that the application be delegated to officers to determine, subject to no significant material objections being raised.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive/Director of Planning/Team Leader to grant planning permission after the expiry of the consultation period and following the consideration of consultation responses, subject to the



conditions relating to time period and the work being carried out in accordance with the plans submitted, together with any other conditions considered relevant to address any matters arising from consultation responses.

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.

NOTED.

