Application Ref: NP/19/0153/FUL

Case Officer: Andrew Richards
Applicant: J & J Mansfield/Horton-Mansfield, Pembrokeshire Seaweeds Ltd
Agent: Mr C Kimpton, CK Planning International
Proposal: Change of Use of C3 Dwellinghouse to Mixed Use Comprising A1 Shop, A3 Canteen and B1 Business, including single storey extensions to front and rear to provide canteen, porch, kitchen and toilet facilities.

Site Location: The Mount, 66, New Street, St Davids, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6SU
Grid Ref: SM75642568
Date Valid: 02-Apr-2019
Target Date: 26-Jun-2019

This application is before committee as the officer recommendation of refusal is contrary to the views of St Davids City Council.

Consultee Response

St Davids City Council: Conditional consent
PCNPA Tree and Landscape Officer: Conditional consent
PCNPA Planning Ecologist: No adverse comments
PCNPA Park Direction: Refusal as contrary to policy
PCNPA Buildings Conservation Officer: No adverse comment
PCC Transportation and Environment: Refusal
PCC Pollution Control: No adverse comment
PCC Drainage Engineers: SAB approval required
PCC Access Officer: No response received
Dwr Cymru Welsh Water: Conditional consent
Dyfed Archaeological Trust: No adverse comment

Public Response

A site notice and neighbour notification letters were posted in accordance with requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012.

Forty letters of support have been received and raise the following matters:
- Sustainable business proposed
- Educational facility which will cover flora and fauna together with research
- Development will sell local produce
- Eco friendly function
- Development will promote marine algae of North Pembrokeshire
- Creation of nine jobs
- New tourism facility which will improve visitor experience
- Enhancement of existing neglected building
- Development accords with Well-Being and Future Generations Act
- Will contribute to local economy
- Enhancement of the ‘Pollinator Trail’ around the city
- Extensions proposed will enhance the existing building
- Already commercial and mixed use premises within the surrounding area

Twelve letters of concern/objection have been received and raise the following matters:
- The development will spoil the character of the existing building especially in relation to the proposed dining room extension
- Privacy impact
- Commercial production unit in a residential area
- Parking issues
- Fumes and noise issues
- Access and road safety issues
- Impact on Chapel of Rest which is immediately adjacent to the site
- Sewerage issues from development
- Light pollution
- Overshadowing impact on neighbours
- Over bearing impact on neighbours
- Landscape impact
- Over development of the site
- Other more suitable premises currently available within the area
- Phase 2 needs to be considered at the same time to ensure the full impact can be considered
- Impact on neighbours from the proposed operating hours

The above concerns/objections have been addressed within the main report.

Policies considered

Please note that these policies can be viewed on the Policies page Pembrokeshire Coast National Park website - http://www.pembrokeshirecoast.org.uk/default.asp?PID=549

LDP Policy 01 - National Park Purposes and Duty
LDP Policy 05 - St Davids Local Centre
LDP Policy 08 - Special Qualities
LDP Policy 09 - Light Pollution
LDP Policy 11 - Protection of Biodiversity
LDP Policy 13 - Historic Landscapes Parks and Gardens
LDP Policy 15 - Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park
LDP Policy 29 - Sustainable Design
LDP Policy 30 - Amenity
LDP Policy 31 - Minimising Waste
LDP Policy 32 - Surface Water Drainage
LDP Policy 35 - Visitor Economy
LDP Policy 48 - Community Facilities and Infrastructure Requirements
LDP Policy 49 - Retail in the National Park
LDP Policy 50 - Town and District Shopping Centres
LDP Policy 52 - Sustainable Transport
LDP Policy 53 - Impacts on traffic
PPW10
SPG04 - Planning Obligations
SPG05 - Sustainable Design
SPG06 - Landscape
SPG12 - Parking
SPG13 - Archaeology
SPG21 - Recreational and Leisure Activities
SPG23 - Enabling Sustainable Development in Welsh NPAs
TAN 04 - Retailing and Town Centres
TAN 05 - Nature Conservation and Planning
TAN 06 - Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities
TAN 11 - Noise
TAN 12 - Design
TAN 13 - Tourism
TAN 14 - Coastal Planning
TAN 15 - Development and Flood Risk
TAN 18 - Transport
TAN 23 - Economic Development
TAN 24 - The Historic Environment

**Constraints**

Historic Landscape
Safeguarding Zone
Hazardous Zones
Potential for surface water flooding
LDP Centre: 50pc aff housing: 30 units/ha
Recreation Character Areas
Affordable Housing Submarkets
Officer’s Appraisal

Background and History

The application is located along the one way traffic system within New Street, St Davids. The property is a detached two storey dwelling with an attached single storey stables wing to the north and a detached single garage to the north east. The dwelling sits within a large plot and is accessed via a narrow drive which runs parallel to the south east boundary. A small area is available for parking and turning to the rear of the property and the remaining land is given over to formal amenity space. The site also benefits from mature landscaping to the frontage areas.

No recent planning history has been identified for this site.

Current Proposal

Planning approval is sought for the change of use of C3 dwelling house to mixed use comprising A1 shop, A3 canteen and B1 business, including single storey extensions to the front elevation to provide canteen, entrance porch and to the rear elevation to provide kitchen extension and toilet facilities.

Key Issues

The application raises the following planning matters:
- Policy and Principle of Development
- Visual Amenity and Special Qualities of the National Park
- Siting and Sustainable Design
- Amenity and Privacy
- Highway Safety and Access
- Landscaping
- Biodiversity
- Land Drainage and Flooding

Policy and Principle of Development

The application site is located in the St Davids Local Centre as defined in the Local Development Plan. Policy 5 states the land use priorities for St Davids, including affordable housing, employment development, the protection and enhancement of the district shopping centre, the protection and enhancement of the City’s special qualities and improvements in traffic management.

The site comprises a large house within its own grounds. The immediate area is wholly residential in character and the site is bounded on three sides directly by the boundaries of other residential properties and to the fourth side by New Street. There are further residential properties across the road from the site.

Whilst within the Centre boundary for St Davids, the site is not within the district shopping centre for St Davids, identified in the Local Development Plan. The
identification of such shopping centres and the accompanying Policy 50 in the Plan is intended to ensure that the vitality, viability and diversity of such areas is maintained and enhanced. Planning Policy Wales edition 10 states in 4.3.18 that the Welsh Government operates a ‘town centres first’ policy in relation to the location of new retail and commercial centre development. In implementing this policy, planning authorities should adopt a sequential approach to the selection of new sites in their development plan when determining planning applications for retail and other complementary uses. By adopting a sequential approach first preference should be to locate new development within a retail and commercial centre defined in the development plan hierarchy of centres. Conversely, significant commercial and business development outside of the defined district shopping centre without following the sequential approach may undermine its vitality and viability. The applicant’s attempts to apply a sequential approach are explained further below.

Paragraph 4.3.14 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 10) states that when considering planning applications for retail uses, planning authorities should first consider whether there is a need for additional retail provision. This approach reinforces the role of centres. No evidence has been submitted with the application to demonstrate the need for additional retail space in St Davids. Annual retail surveys undertaken by the Authority for all of the retail centres in the National Park and the conclusions of a recent regional retail study have not identified a need to allocate additional retail space in St Davids or elsewhere through the ongoing revision of the Local Development Plan.

Details provided with the application indicate that the site will be used for the making and retailing of health and cosmetic products, with on-site activities, including workshops and exhibitions and a ‘canteen’ which will ‘become a destination in itself’ open daily for fine wild dining, evening and special events. The whole development introduces a considerable amount of activity into this residential area and a successful business operation of this scale would have significant impact on the amenity and privacy of the surrounding residential properties. Policy 15 of the Local Development Plan resists development that fails to protect the National Park and its special qualities, including proposals introducing or intensifying a use incompatible with its location.

Whilst the planning statement notes that New Street is characterised by a number of businesses and commercial enterprises, these are almost entirely concentrated at the south western end of the street with numbers becoming sparser to the north east where the land use is predominantly residential. Policy 30 of the Local Development Plan which seeks to resist development with unacceptable amenity impacts is engaged with regard to the uses proposed and hours of operation. Amenity may also be affected by the anticipated increase in operational traffic to the site (Policy 53).

It is noted that there is a discrepancy between the application form where the application states that no neighbours have been consulted and the planning statement which states that the applicants have consulted with all their adjoining neighbours, ‘none of whom have any objections to the proposed development.’
It is clear from the information provided with the application that the applicants are confident in growing their business rapidly within the first 5 years. The introduction of a commercial enterprise allowing several business uses in this residential area is a cause for concern. Whilst there are other businesses along the length of New Street, these are generally located close to the City Centre. The City Inn, on New Street is a long-established hotel/restaurant and anyone moving into the area will have made a choice of residing alongside this establishment. The introduction of B1, A3 and A1 uses into the area is for the planning authority to determine in terms of suitability and as highlighted above there is likely to be significant conflict with the established residential use.

The proposed safeguards suggested by the applicant such as orientation and size of the proposed extension, window openings and boundary treatments are unlikely to satisfactorily mitigate the impact on amenity caused by introducing large numbers of people into the site for shopping, eating and viewing of exhibitions. This will be exacerbated further by evening dining events. Mitigating such impacts to a level commensurate with a residential use would require restrictive conditions which would heavily restrict operation of the business. Even so, planning permission is granted for the land/site and not for the current occupants. Should this business fail or outgrow the site, any uses granted permission will remain, as does the potential for harm to the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents/property owners.

Correspondence has been received from third parties, which raises concerns about the proposal to introduce these uses within this area and indicates that there are several other premises within the local area which would be more suitable. No details of the alternative premises have been provided.

Additional information submitted by the agent gives a brief summary of the applicants’ investigations into the purchase of other properties within St Davids. The submitted information indicates that they did explore the purchase of one building within the defined retail area at St Davids and another outside of the retail area. They also advise having ‘looked at’ a further two buildings in the retail area. The applicants advise that all retail centre options were explored but discounted due to cost, suitability, adaptability or accessibility. The applicants have therefore taken appropriate steps to seek premises outside of the retail centre.

Any site however has to be suitable in land use planning terms for the particular use proposed and in this instance it is considered not to be appropriate to introduce a mixed commercial/retail use within an established residential area. The level of mitigation required to make the proposed use acceptable in this location is considerable and this alone would suggest that the use is not appropriate and results in a fundamental policy objection to the application in terms of its location.

The proposal would therefore introduce business and commercial uses within an established residential area with significant impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties and for the reasons outlined above would not be supported in principle and is contrary to policies 15, 30 and 53 of the Local Development Plan.

*Visual Amenity and Special Qualities of the National Park:*

Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
Development Management Committee – 19th June 2019
Correspondence has been received which raises concerns and objection on landscape impact on surrounding areas from over development and impact on the character of the existing property.

In considering the application the impact of the proposal on the National Park landscape is a key consideration and Policies 8 and 15 are particularly relevant. Policy 15 aims to control development causing a significant visual intrusion. In addition to these policies the Authority has adopted a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) of which the site falls within the boundary of LCA 17 (St Davids).

LCA 17 recognises that this is an area which comprises the urban area of St David’s and is surrounded by open rolling lowland landscape of the St David’s Headland. The LCA was defined by the urban form of the city and there is a strong sense of place and the nature and extent of the imposing cathedral building and its ecclesiastical ruins generates an awareness of the long-established importance of this settlement in Welsh History. The Medieval buildings and features within the cathedral close are the core defining characteristic. St David’s and its environs have an historical landscape of outstanding value and is arguably of international significance for its importance within the Christian church.

LCA Management guidance indicates that new development should seek to maintain the integrity of historic buildings and archaeological sites, with particular emphasis on their visual setting. The need to preserve the traditional city character, through planning of developments to ensure they are in-keeping with the character of the traditional built form, whilst balancing the need for sustainable economic development serving the needs of visitors and residents alike.

There is a need to conserve the local vernacular of stone buildings with slate/grouted roofs and ensure that the siting, form, layout, construction materials and finishes of new or refurbished building is appropriate to the character of the city, especially at ‘gateways’ where such buildings will create important first impressions for the first-time visitor. There is also a need to rehabilitate the edges of the settlement so as to be more sympathetic to the surrounding Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales, with particular emphasis on achieving a smooth transition from the urban edge to the open countryside.

The development site is located within a residential area surrounded by a mix of one, one and a half and two storey buildings. Whilst the host dwelling is large and set within a large plot when compared to the adjoining dwellings, the host property is set back into the plot which gives it a generous garden frontage with the associated access, parking and turning facilities together with areas of amenity space are also located to the rear of the property within a small area. The provision of a new single storey front extension to provide a canteen area and entrance porch together with a large paved area is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the character of the existing structure when viewed from New Street.
To the rear an additional single storey lean-to extension will provide an enlarged kitchen area, toilet and access facilities, and the structure in combination with the front extensions provides nearly 90m² of additional floor space accommodation on the ground floor. The total proposed built form within the site totals 328m² and the remaining open space on the site total 1,060m² and therefore the proposed built development in this instance is not considered to constitute over development of the site.

The proposed development when viewed from the surrounding landscape will be read in context with the existing built form within St David’s. Given the existing topography of the site and the location of the nearby residential developments along Nun Street, New Street, Maes Dewi and further north east within Mount Gardens, the proposed development when viewed from the surrounding landscape will not be considered to have an adverse impact. The development’s scale and form is also considered to be well related to the existing built form of St Davids and development surrounding residential properties.

As such, it is considered that the current proposal is acceptable in terms of visual amenity and retains the special qualities of this area of the National Park and also the character and identity of the local centre of St David’s.

Siting and Sustainable Design:

Policy 8 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (LDP) is a strategic policy which refers to the special qualities of the National Park and lists priorities to ensure that these special qualities will be protected and enhanced. Policy 15 of the LDP seeks the conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park with criteria ‘a’, ‘b’ and ‘d’ resisting development that would cause significant visual intrusion, be insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape, and/or fail to harmonise with, or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park. Policy 29 of the LDP requires all development proposals to be well designed in terms of place and local distinctiveness (criterion ‘a’).

Consultation response letters have been received which raise concerns in that phase 2 of the development proposal needs to be considered at the same time as phase 1 to ensure the full impact can be considered.

The current proposal details alterations and extension to the host dwelling to covert the property from a residential use into a mixed commercial unit. The extensions are considered to have a siting which is considered to be acceptable in the context of the existing building and the layout of the site. The proposed scale, form, design and mass of the extensions are also considered to be acceptable in relation to the host property.

The concern raised in relation to phase 2 details is not shared by officers and the current proposal has been considered on its planning merits. It is noted that phase 2 will include the proposed change of use and alterations of the existing milking parlour and stores into an education and processing facility. This aspect will require an
ecology survey which is not complete at this time and therefore delays the formal submission of phase 2.

Amenity and Privacy:

Policy 30 of the LDP refers to ‘amenity’ in general seeking to avoid incompatible development and significant adverse impact upon the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring properties particularly where the development is an inappropriate use, is of a scale incompatible with its surroundings, development leads to an increase in traffic, noise, odour or light or the development is visually intrusive.

Correspondence has been received which raises concerns on the development having a privacy impact, light pollution impact, the development will disturb mourners visiting the adjacent chapel of rest, the development will result in overshadowing and loss of light impact, the development will be over-bearing on neighbouring buildings, the development includes a commercial production unit within a residential area, the development will cause fumes and noise issues and the proposed opening hours will cause impact on amenity.

St Davids City Council have also indicated that they suggest that the property incorporates triple glazing to reduce noise spillage from the building and that the property incorporates an appropriate ventilation system and other systems to reduce the noise output in general terms from the site.

The development does not proposed to increase the level of fenestration at first floor level and subject to the scheme incorporating appropriate boundary treatments to limit overlooking at ground level which would be required through a planning condition imposed on any consent that granted. As such, it is considered that the current proposal together with the additional boundary treatments required will not result in any greater impact on privacy of the adjacent neighbouring dwellings.

Whilst it is recognised that the site is immediately adjacent to St Davids Chapel of Rest and the access to the host property runs parallel with the Chapel of Rests access. The proposed change of use from a residential dwelling to a mixed use business property in this context is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the current use of the Chapel of Rest.

The proposal includes additional development in the form of single storey extensions to the front and rear elevations and these additions are not considered in this instance to constitute a scale of development which would result in the loss of light and cause over-shadowing impacts on adjacent properties. In addition the development is also not considered to result in any greater over-bearing impact on neighbouring properties than that caused by the existing host dwelling.

No details have been included within the application to detail any external lighting on the proposed scheme. Whilst it is recognised that the site is located within a urban area the proposal could have a significant impact on neighbouring properties and the surrounding landscape through insensitive external lighting being used on any development which is granted consent. As such, a planning condition would be
imposed to control any external lighting to ensure that any development approved would protect the surrounding neighbour’s amenity, local ecology and prevent any significant light pollution within the surrounding landscape.

Pembrokeshire County Council Pollution Control section has indicated that the development relates to the provision of commercial activities associated with the processing of natural materials in the form of seaweeds and flora collected under licence from around the St Davids peninsula. To make associated products in the form of soaps, scrubs, ointments and food for sale to the general public with the inclusion of educational activities related to the foraging of the relevant species, their processing and consumption and/or use of the final products.

Based on the nature of the proposal and the low key processing and production of products from the natural materials together with the food preparation, the Pollution Control section does not raise any adverse comments or would suggest any conditions to be imposed on any consent that may be granted in relation to the current proposal by the Authority.

The application states opening hours within the application linked to the three separate uses and these are considered to be appropriate for the current proposal in this instance. As such, a planning condition would be imposed on any consent granted to control the development within these times.

If any adverse impacts arise including noise, odour and opening hours during the operation of the business these would be controlled though separate legislation at that time.

However, whilst the concerns raised through the consultation process in relation to amenity and privacy have been addressed, the principle concerns as mentioned earlier within the report on location of the proposal within a residential area have not been overcome and officers remain concerned with the principle the proposal in this instance.

Highway Safety and Access:

The property is partially screened from the road behind a hedge and bank. The access is onto New Street which is part of the A487 and where traffic goes just one way clockwise. It is 55 metres from the junction with Nun Street. There are currently single yellow lines on this length of Road, guarding against parking during most of the day, and generally it is just odd instances of loading/unloading from delivery vehicles, and short stay visitor cars, that are stopping for the three dwellings here. The speed limit is 30 MPH.

The property access is narrow and at a slight oblique angle to the Highway, which means that vehicles using it tend to pull out right into oncoming traffic before turning left "in", which is a manoeuvre captured on the current Google Street-scene images. At the top of the long drive (50 metres long), at the rear of the property, there is a garage and a yard. This area appears to be satisfactory for serving the current domestic use and could be accepted had the proposal just been for a modest sized
extension to the living accommodation. The exit onto the A487 has acceptable visibility looking towards oncoming traffic, partly helped by the location onto the start of the bend in the Road, although there is limited visibility of pedestrians on the footway.

The poor access arrangements and very limited parking/turning facilities mean that this property is not suitable for any form of business use that encourages tourists or customers, nor for workshops that attract the volume of staff clearly suggested now.

Traffic on the Class 1 Road merges at just 55 metres from the access, and even though the traffic from the north-east has priority, these drivers will mostly be concentrating on the other vehicles emerging from the south-western part of the A487, and on the accesses on the north side and the approaching bend. Even if there are large signs placed facing traffic located on the northern corner of the garden (by removing hedge), and if they are forewarned of the business location, it will be difficult for drivers of customer or tourist vehicles to be fully aware of the access to the business without hesitating or carrying out dangerous manoeuvres. The dangers of this confusion on the approach to the access will be compounded by the layout and the narrowness of the access. There will be little encouragement to pull a car up the narrow driveway, even if going to a Disabled Parking place, because none of the parking area will be visible from the road. When a tourist car gets to the top of the drive, the driver will find each of the three identified spaces much tighter to get into and to turn from than is normally expected. The narrow driveway gives absolutely no possibility of passing two cars (one in and one out), but due to the combination of very limited parking and turning there will be every likelihood that cars will be constantly reversing out onto the bend of the A487. When this occurs, the lack of visibility of pedestrians on the footway of the A487 will become an increased danger.

The predictions that the businesses will generally only attract pedestrians cannot be agreed to. Whilst accepting that the main bulk of tourists walk 550 metres to get to the centre of the City and over 750 metres to get to the Cathedral and Precincts; the site is in itself 650 metres from this main car park, but in the outward town direction. There is nothing up this end of the development limits of the City to encourage them to make the detour. It is 450 metres from Quickwell car park, but there can be very limited parking here. The car park beyond the Cathedral is over 1 kilometre away. Those that may walk will not find a safe pedestrian access into the site due to conflicts with vehicles using the driveway and the yard.

The car parks at the City Hotel and by the CK’s supermarket are privately owned and not available. Parking at the St David’s Rugby Club may be useful, but only at times to suit the Rugby Club as there are obviously other activities at this location. This in itself is a walk of over 300 metres and with a crossing over the more “open” section of the A487. It is noted that no mechanism is suggested so as to ensure that this offer could not be removed at a later date. Without control, the two sites are in different ownership and therefore cannot be relied upon.

There is conflicting information regarding who will use the driveway and the parking spaces, and there is no attempt to mark the spaces out for Disabled on the plan. The
requirement to have a minimum of two full sized Disabled parking spaces is contained within the SPG Parking Guidelines, but so is the need to have further off-street parking to cover all the elements of the business at this location. There are strong concerns that there will be constant row of parking on the street as well as the dangerous manoeuvres, adding to the dangers for passing motorists. There is no “lay-by” as suggested in the covering text, but just the crossover of the footway to get to up to four properties. The “standing bay” behind the footway is not part of the Highway but part of the private ownership associated with the access arrangements for these other properties.

Correspondence has also been received which raises concerns with the development in respect of access, parking issues and road safety issues. These concerns are shared by the highway officer as detailed above.

Based on the concerns raised above the highway officer has indicated that the application should be refused as the proposal is contrary to LDP Policy 53 due to the traffic generated by the development using an existing access which is unsuitable because it has restricted width at the junction with the county road, the proposed development does not make adequate provision for the parking of vehicles clear of the public highway, the dimensions of the site are insufficient to accommodate a feasible turning area within its curtilage, the slowing down and turning of traffic will adversely affect the free flow and safety of traffic on the highway, the proposed development could cause a danger to road users by reason of standing vehicles and the layout of the proposed access would endanger pedestrians.

Landscaping:

Correspondence has been received which raises concerns on the loss of landscaping on the site. St Davids City Council also requests that the current scheme should include additional landscaping to ensure adequate screening is provided between the development site and the neighbouring residential properties.

Upon visiting the site the applicant has carried out some work to the existing landscaping in respect of the front hedge and several trees on the boundary and within the site.

It is noted that the current application is limited in respect of the details submitted on the existing landscaping provision and any details on proposed landscaping. As such, a condition would be imposed on any consent granted to ensure that a tree survey, details of tree protection, pre-development tree work, details of any landscaping and new planting are agreed with the authority prior to any works commencing on site. This condition would assist in addressing the landscaping aspect on the site and screening of development from neighbouring properties.

Biodiversity:

PPW, TAN5 and LDP policy 11 requires biodiversity and landscape considerations to be taken into account in determining individual applications. The presence of a species protected under UK or European legislation is a material consideration when
dealing with applications that are likely to result in disturbance or harm to the species or its habitat.

The planning Ecologist has commented on the application stating that a protected species survey or habitat survey is not required in this instance. As such, the proposal conforms with the relevant requirements of PPW, TANS and LDP policy 11.

Land Drainage and Flooding:

Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has indicated that they support the current proposal subject to conditions to ensure no surface water from the new extensions is allowed to discharge into the public sewerage system and details of a suitable grease trap is submitted and approved in writing and then installed prior to the development being brought into use. They also request that an informative be added to advise the applicant that they may need to apply for any connection to the public sewer.

Correspondence has been received which raises concerns in relation to the foul water discharge from the site. Dwr Cymru Welsh Water consider that based on the above comments they support the application and therefore the concerns raised with the foul water discharge from the site are not considered to be substantiated in this instance.

Pembrokeshire County Council Drainage Engineers have indicated that as the current development of new hard surfaces exceeds 100m² the development will need separate SAB approval and an informative would be added to any consent granted to ensure the applicant is made aware of this aspect.

Conclusion

It is clear that the proposals is acceptable in terms of the design and siting of the proposed extensions, on landscaping grounds and would have no additional impact on the character of the building. However, it is considered that the location of the new commercial premises with the mix of uses proposed within the current application would result in significant adverse impact on neighbouring properties at this location and would have traffic safety implications and therefore cannot be support by officers in this instance.

Recommendation

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would introduce a business and commercial uses within an established residential area with significant impact on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties and is contrary to Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2010) policies 15 and 30 of the Local Development Plan.

2. The traffic generated by the development would use an existing access which is unsuitable because it has restricted width at the junction with the County
3. the parking of vehicles clear of the public highway and is contrary to Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2010) policy 53 (Impacts of Traffic).

4. The dimension of the site is insufficient to accommodate a feasible turning area within its curtilage and is contrary to Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2010) policy 53 (Impacts of Traffic).

5. The slowing down and turning of traffic will adversely affect the free flow and safety of traffic on the highway and is contrary to Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2010) policy 53 (Impacts of Traffic).

6. The proposed development could cause a danger to road users by reason of standing vehicles and is contrary to Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2010) policy 53 (Impacts of Traffic).

7. The layout of the proposed access would endanger pedestrians and is contrary to Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2010) policy 53 (Impacts of Traffic).
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