

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

23 January 2019

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

Mr A Archer, Councillor P Baker, Mrs D Clements, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor P Harries, Mrs G Hayward, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor PJ Morgan, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 12.00pm]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Evans, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs J James, Councillor M James and Dr RM Plummer.

2. Disclosures of interest

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

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minute 8(b)below</i> Tree Preservation Order 139 Barbeque Lawn, Saundersfoot	Councillor P Baker	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minute 8(b)below</i> Tree Preservation Order 139 Barbeque Lawn, Saundersfoot	Mr AE Sangster	Remained in the meeting and voted on the matter

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 5 December 2018 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was noted that Minutes 6(e) and 6(i) should both have referred to the addition of a phasing element to the highways condition which had been agreed at the meeting.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 5 December 2018 be confirmed and signed subject to the above amendment.

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/18/0665/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Change of use of Dan y Garn from holiday accommodation to residential use - Treleddydd Fawr, St Davids	Mr Christopher Kimpton - Agent
NP/18/0665/FUL <i>Minute 6(d) refers</i>	One Planet Development to include a cabin (caravan), lean-to greenhouse, outbuilding, barn, polytunnel, timber-store, stall - Land adjacent to Fachongle Isaf, Cilgwyn, Newport	Mr John Powell - Applicant
NP/18/0559/FUL <i>Minute 6(e) refers</i>	14 affordable housing units, 2 open market houses and upgrading 85 tents and tourers to 85 static caravans with associated landscaping and roads. New pumping station - Buttyland Caravan Park, Station Road, Manorbier	Mr Gerald Blain - Agent

5. 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



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*):

[With the agreement of the Chair, the following application was brought forward in the agenda to allow the agent to leave early]

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/18/0665/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Meixner
PROPOSAL: Change of use of Dan y Garn from holiday accommodation to residential use
LOCATION: Treleddydd Fawr, St Davids

It was reported that the current proposal sought to change the use of the building which was currently permitted to be used for holiday letting, to a full residential dwelling. The building was of three bedrooms and of traditional stone construction; no external changes were proposed. A draft unilateral undertaking in respect of a sum towards affordable housing had been submitted with the application, however this had not been signed or completed.

The item was before the Committee as St Davids City Council had supported the application as such a change of use would have no visual impact, however this was contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

The officer explained that when the original application had been granted in 1989, the condition restricting use of the holiday unit had been applied in order to resist new uses in the open countryside, and it remained valid and enforceable. An application earlier in 2018 (NP/18/0486/S73) to remove that condition, had been withdrawn, as officers had proposed exchanging it for a more modern condition which would have allowed year-round holiday use, but which the applicants had felt would be more restrictive. This condition allowed for an economic benefit to the area in terms of supporting the local tourism economy in a way which full time residential did not have and was echoed in paragraph 3.56 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) (version 10).

The report noted that the property was located outside of any of the Centres defined in the adopted Local Development Plan and was therefore considered to be in the countryside. In such circumstances, the Plan allows for the conversion of appropriate buildings to a range of uses but prioritises employment-related uses, which included holiday letting as



a use supporting the local tourism economy. Taking into consideration accessibility to Centres, the property did not meet the criteria required to support full-time residential use. Given that there was no over-riding material consideration which outweighed the current adopted policy guidance in this instance, the application could not be supported and was recommended for refusal.

The agent, Mr Chris Kimpton, then addressed the Committee. He referred to the current permission which allowed occupation except for the period 10 January to 28 February and so could be lived in for ten and a half months of the year. He considered this to be a material consideration and questioned the difference between that level of occupancy and what was now before the Committee. He explained that the previous application had been withdrawn as the model condition proposed would have been more restrictive than the one currently in force.

Turning to the proposed reasons for refusal Mr Kimpton stated that neither paragraph 5.5.3 of PPW nor Local Development Plan Policy 7 precluded residential development and noted that there were many caravan and camping sites, as well as holiday cottages in the area, such that the loss of Dan y Garn would not threaten tourism in the area. He also pointed out that the reference, in reason 3, to para 4.2.24 of PPW, related to new build, and therefore did not apply. Mr Kimpton noted the recent approval at Lawrenny Road, Cresselly contrary to Policy 52 (sustainable travel) and argued that Dan y Garn was not suitable for affordable housing, however his clients were willing to accept conditions relating to provision of a car charging point and site restoration as had been required in the Cresselly case. Finally, with regard to proposed reason no 5 (failure to provide for a contribution towards affordable housing provision), he did not understand why the draft unilateral agreement submitted did not carry any weight, stating that it would result in a contribution of some £13,900 to affordable housing provision.

Mr Kimpton noted that the application would have little net impact on traffic, with no objection from the Highway Authority, and could become more accessible by other sustainable means of transport in the future as a result of changes in car design. He concluded that the change would not affect the natural beauty of the National Park and he asked Members to extend the use of this property from ten and a half to twelve months of the year.

Given Mr Kimpton's statement regarding the submission of the unilateral agreement, one Member asked officers to explain why reason 5 had been included. Officers noted that as the agreement had been submitted in draft only, and should the application be approved that day it would not be binding. In addition, should a refusal which did not contain reason 5 be



subject to an appeal, adding the reason at a later date could lead to an award of costs against the Authority. Another Member asked whether the current condition restricting use of the property to ten and a half months of the year was enforceable and officers replied that if there was evidence that the property was not being used as a holiday let, a breach of condition notice could be served. The Director of Planning and Park Direction added that changes of use to holiday units supported the local economy, and the updated condition previously proposed allowed for year-round tourism but also made the intended use as a holiday let much clearer.

DECISION: That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal to change the use of the property to full residential use from a holiday let is contrary to the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted September 2010) Policy 7 which seeks to ensure that conversions of existing buildings are acceptable within the countryside and include the prioritisation of conversions to employment uses (holiday lets).**
- 2. The proposal to change the use of the property to full residential from a holiday let is contrary to the PPW 10 p85 para 5.5.3 which states that in rural areas tourism-related development is an essential element in providing for a healthy and diverse economy.**
- 3. The proposal to change the use of the property to full residential from a holiday let is contrary to the PPW 10 p59 para 4.2.24 which states that in the open countryside, away from established settlements. The fact that a single house on a particular site would be unobtrusive is not by itself, a good argument in favour of permission; such permissions could be granted too often, to the overall detriment of the character of the area'. Such a change would create an unfortunate precedent in the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park.**
- 4. The proposal to change the use of the property to full residential from a holiday let is contrary to the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted September 2010) Policy 7 and Policy 52 which seeks to ensure that full residential development in the countryside is accessible by sustainable means of travel.**
- 5. The proposal to change the use of the property to full residential from a holiday let is contrary to the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted September 2010) Policy 45**



(d) and adopted SPG as it does not provide for a contribution towards affordable housing provision.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/18/0541/S73
APPLICANT: Mr P Morgan, Morgan Construction
PROPOSAL: Variation of condition no 2 of NP/15/0194/FUL to amend the design of Plot no's 10, 11 and 17 from 1 bed bungalows to 2 bed 1.5 storey dwellings
LOCATION: Land off Feidr Eglwys, Newport

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn.

NOTED.

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/18/0542/S73
APPLICANT: Mr P Morgan, Morgan Construction
PROPOSAL: Variation of condition no 2 of NP/15/0194/FUL to amend the layout of the affordable housing unit no's 3 to 9 inclusive
LOCATION: Land off Feidr Eglwys, Newport

Members were reminded that planning permission had been granted in 2016 for a residential development comprising 35 dwellings on land adjacent to Feidr Eglwys, Newport. Of the 35 dwellings proposed, 14 were affordable units, accessed via Feidr Eglwys, a further 2 market dwellings would be accessed via Feidr Eglwys and the remaining dwellings would be set out in two 'cul-de-sacs' both accessed via Feidr Bentick. The existing field boundaries were to be retained with housing development laid out between them.

The current application sought permission to vary the layout of the affordable dwellings on the site, and the officer clarified that it had been requested that plots 6, 7 and 9 became a central terrace, with flats to the east, rather than the description set out under 'Current Proposal' in the report. This would allow the Registered Social Landlord to better manage the site.

Officers considered that the proposed amendment to the layout of plots 3 to 9 was acceptable, as the proposed amendment would not result in a materially different development to that originally proposed. It was clarified that that the application would still be subject to the original legal agreement. It was therefore recommended that it be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report.



Some Members noted that they had received correspondence with regard to a footpath on the site, and officers reassured them that this would be monitored to ensure it was completed as per the original approval. They also confirmed that they had received emails expressing concern about large vehicles, mud on the road and removal of trees and noted that a management plan for the site had been approved, and the situation would continue to be monitored to ensure its compliance.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, phasing, site levels, samples of materials, construction method statement, protection of trees, landscaping, archaeology, parking and turning, access roads, surface water drainage, water supply, external lighting, protected species, contamination, undergrounding of cables and permitted development.

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/18/0545/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr J Powell
PROPOSAL: One Planet Development to include a cabin (caravan), lean-to greenhouse, outbuilding, barn, polytunnel, timber-store, stall
LOCATION: Land adjacent to Fachongle Isaf, Cilgwyn, Newport

It was reported that planning permission was sought for a single household One Planet Development (OPD) comprising a detached dwelling, barn, outbuilding for utilities and compost toilet, poly tunnel, timber store and a farm gate stand for the sale of produce.

Applicants for an OPD were expected to be able to meet 65% of their basic food needs from their land, either by producing all of the 65% from the land, or by producing no less than 30% from their land and the remaining 35% using income derived from the sale/barter of produce grown and reared on their site. In this instance, it was reported that the applicants were already productive at the site and grew 61% of their food in dedicated vegetable plots, orchard and forest garden, with the remaining 4% sourced using income derived from the sale or barter of their produce grown/reared on site. The land-based income would be based on floristry and cut flowers, plant propagation and sales, vegetable and soft fruit crops and beekeeping/honey.

Officers had fully considered the proposed OPD against the relevant national and local planning policy framework, with the proposed Management Plan adequately addressing the requirement for an OPD in the open countryside, and the application was recommended for approval.



Mr John Powell, the applicant, was in attendance at the Committee and made himself available to answer any questions. Members were impressed with the effort already put into the site which meant that the applicants already met their basic food needs from the site. However, Members questioned whether they were confident in being able to increase this to create the income needed to deliver the management plan. Mr Powell replied that having demonstrated they could meet the minimum requirement and having got to know the land, he believed that current production could be exceeded in future through efficiencies and better management. He added that although his background was in Earth Sciences, he had been working as a gardener and landscaper in north Pembrokeshire in recent years and this had also increased his knowledge of cultivation in the area.

The Chair drew attention to the comments of Dr R Plummer on this application which she had circulated to Members as she could not be present, and this made reference to monitoring of the Management Plan. Other Members asked whether, in future, they could be circulated with a copy of the Management Plan as this was integral to these applications. One Member added that he had requested a copy of the Management Plan and had received satisfactory responses to his questions on it from the officer. However, he suggested that conditions should be included which controlled retail activities on the site and the permitted development rights for micro generation. Members agreed to the addition of these conditions.

Comment was also made by some Members regarding what they considered to be the poor design of the proposed dwelling and regretted that it seemed to be lacking in any reference to the countryside around it.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with the Management Plan, submission of annual monitoring reports, construction method statement, external lighting, permitted development rights and retail activities.

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/18/0559/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr D Brown & *ateb*
PROPOSAL: 14 affordable housing units, 2 open market houses and upgrading 85 tents and tourers to 85 static caravans with associated landscaping and roads. New pumping station.
LOCATION: Buttyland Caravan Park, Station Road, Manorbier

The application was reported to the Committee as it was a major development.



It was reported that the application site was a long-established caravan site which straddled the Rural Centre boundary, as defined by Policy 6 of the Local Development Plan (LDP), with the eastern part of the site (the caravan and camping site) falling in the open countryside. The site had been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions as officers considered there was potential to release an allocated housing site, provide long term environmental gains through the development of strategic landscaping and improved sewerage for the settlement. Although this potential remained, officers had concluded that it was not realised in the form of the present application and had therefore recommended refusal.

The report set out the extensive planning history for the site, which had originally been granted permission for 35 touring units in 1994, with a further 35 touring caravans or tents granted permission (between 1 March and 28 September) through a Certificate of Lawfulness in 2013. Officers were of the view that the replacement of 70 seasonal touring pitches and 15 seasonal tent pitches with 85 year-round static caravans did not provide an environmental benefit by means of a reduction in number and would in fact result in an intensification of the use of the site, contrary to the aims of the LDP. While landscaping had been proposed, this was also considered to be insufficient to mitigate the development, which would have a significant adverse visual impact on the National Park.

The report went on to outline that while the housing element of the application was acceptable, there were also concerns at the large amount of hedgerow to be removed to allow for development of the pumping station, which would have a detrimental urbanising visual impact on the rural character of the area. Officers noted that a draft S106 Agreement for the housing had been submitted, however as the recommendation was of refusal this had not been proceeded with due to the cost to the applicant and in the light of the recommendation to refuse for other reasons. However, it was requested that the absence of a S106 Agreement be given as an additional reason for refusal.

Mr Gerald Blain, the Agent, then addressed the Committee. He explained that negotiations with the Authority and *ateb* had been ongoing for five years. While the conversion of touring to static caravans was outside of policy, it had been agreed that gifting the allocated land to *ateb* for the provision of affordable housing would be a material consideration, and he referred to a letter from the Authority's previous Head of Development Management, Liam Jones in this respect. Extensive pre-application discussions to try to achieve this had taken place, with the potential to release housing and improve the sewerage system for the settlement through the provision of a pumping station. Substantial landscaping had



been proposed, as well as submission of a draft S106 Agreement. The agent also referred to a recent study by GVA Grimley, quoting that spend per static caravan was £15,300 pa against £2,800 pa for a touring pitch; he noted that the potential increase in spend locally was over £1 million. Mr Blain therefore asked that the Committee approve the application, subject to officers agreeing matters relating to the S106 agreement and landscaping, so that six years of discussion could be concluded.

Members sought clarification from the Agent regarding the environmental improvements that his client was prepared to offer. Mr Blain replied that landscaping along the boundary to obliterate the view of the site from the Ridgeway had been discussed and he was confident that an agreement could be reached with officers regarding this, confirming that his client was prepared to 'give a bit more'. Officers, however, felt that significantly more work was needed, and confirmed that they were willing to meet with the applicant to discuss the options and the landscaping required.

While they were disappointed that it had not been possible to bring the scheme to fruition, Members applauded officers for the work to date. They believed that the landscaping issue was not insurmountable, and there was a lot of common ground, and they urged everyone to continue the dialogue so that delivery of a scheme could be achieved in the future.

DECISION: That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal to increase the use of the pitch numbers on site by allowing 85 year round static caravans on a site located in a countryside location will result in an adverse impact on the landscape and the special qualities of the National Park, which is contrary to polices 8, 15, 35, 38 & 39 of the Local Development Plan.**
- 2. Policies 1, 8 and 15 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seek to protect and enhance the pattern and diversity of the landscape, and prevent development that fails to harmonise with or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park, that is insensitively and unsympathetically sited within the landscape and visually intrusive. The proposed development forms a visually intrusive and discordant addition to this rural area that is harmful to the special qualities of the National Park and therefore contrary to policies 1, 8 and 15 of the adopted Local Development Plan Policy and Supplementary Planning Guidance on Landscape Character Assessment.**
- 3. The application fails to provide for affordable housing in perpetuity through the provision of a suitable section 106 agreement. The application therefore fails under Policy 45 (Affordable Housing) and**



Supplementary Planning Guidance for Affordable Housing (adopted 5th November 2014) and is therefore contrary to guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 10, 2018).

[The meeting then adjourned for a 10 minute comfort break]

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/18/0606/FUL
APPLICANT: Misses S & V Chamberlain
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing Woolaway bungalow & replacement dwelling
LOCATION: 26 Angle Village, Angle, Pembroke

It was reported that this property, located within the Centre boundary of Angle Village was a modest detached bungalow of 'pre-fab' construction. The frontage of the site was open in aspect from the wider street scene but set back from the main road behind a front garden. The bungalow fell within the Conservation Area, and an accompanying application for Conservation Area Consent was to be considered by the Committee (Minute 6(g) refers).

The application was before the Committee as the views of Angle Community Council were contrary to those of the planning officer.

Planning permission was sought for the demolition of the pre-fab property and the construction of a dormer bungalow on the same site. The new dwelling would have smooth painted render walls with a grey tile roof and would be traditionally detailed and proportioned.

Angle Community Council were concerned that no single storey buildings facing the main road had dormer or "veluxe" type windows and that the dormer window made the property look asymmetrical, all of which were out of keeping with other properties in the village. Whilst officers agreed that as it was openly visible in the street scene, design was important, and due to its location within the Conservation Area the details should reflect and reinforce the prevailing vernacular. However, officers considered that within Angle there was sufficient variety of appearance between dwellings, and the new dwelling did not stand out as being significantly different within the street scene.

Officers had concluded that the proposal replaced an existing property which had no particular visual or historic merit, and was not up to modern standards. The siting remained the same, and while more modern in construction, the design had referenced the surrounding traditional vernacular. The proposal therefore complied with the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan and was recommended for approval subject to conditions as set out in the report.



DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time, accordance with plans, surface water drainage and fenestration to the front elevation to be of painted timber.

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/18/0607/CAC
APPLICANT: Misses S & V Chamberlain
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing Woolaway bungalow & replacement dwelling
LOCATION: 26 Angle Village, Angle, Pembroke

It was reported that this property, located within the Centre boundary of Angle Village was a modest detached bungalow of 'pre-fab' construction. The frontage of the site was open in aspect from the wider street scene but set back from the main road behind a front garden. The bungalow fell within the Conservation Area, and Conservation Area Consent was therefore required for its demolition.

The application was before the Committee as the views of Angle Community Council were contrary to those of the planning officer. They were concerned that the design of the replacement dwelling was out of keeping with other properties in the village. Whilst officers agreed that as it was openly visible in the street scene, design was important, and due to its location within the Conservation Area the details should reflect and reinforce the prevailing vernacular. However, officers considered that within Angle there was sufficient variety of appearance between dwellings, and the new dwelling did not stand out as being significantly different within the street scene.

Officers considered that there was no conservation merit to the pre-fab bungalow, and demolition of the structure was therefore acceptable. A planning application for a replacement dwelling had been approved under NP/18/0606/FUL (Minutes 6 (f) refers) which should ensure that the site did not remain empty in the future. The proposal complied with the relevant statutory legislative requirements and could be supported by officers.

DECISION: The application for Conservation Area Consent be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans and demolition not to take place more than 3 months before the commencement of works to rebuild the property.



- (h) REFERENCE: NP/18/0610/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr H Thomas, Landway Developments Ltd
PROPOSAL: Residential development of 38 houses (27 open market houses & 11 affordable)
LOCATION: Land opposite Bush Terrace, Jameston, Tenby

It was reported that this land was an allocated site within the Local Development Plan, with an allocation of 35 dwellings. The application was a major development and of public interest. As such it was requested that Members consider a Committee site visit to view the site and its surroundings prior to consideration of the planning application at a subsequent Committee meeting.

One Member suggested that, in view of the fact that this was a large development in Jameston with a lot of interest locally, consideration be given to holding the next meeting of the Committee in Jameston Village Hall. Other Members agreed that it was important to take meetings out to different parts of the National Park, however officers pointed out that several other major applications were likely to be considered at the next meeting and holding the meeting at Llanion Park would be fairer to all concerned. It was agreed that the Chair and officers would consider this more fully and come to a decision.

DECISION: That the application be subject to a Site Inspection.

- (i) REFERENCE: NP/18/0720/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr A Muskett - PCNPA
PROPOSAL: Installation of foul water sewage pumps and connection to main adopted highway sewer
LOCATION: Carew Castle, Castle Lane, Carew, Tenby

This application was reported to the Committee as the proposed development concerned a National Park Authority site.

Officers considered the application to be acceptable, when assessed against the policies of the Local Development Plan, as necessary infrastructure to support the current use of the site. It was reported at the meeting that since writing the report, consultation responses had been received from the Building Conservation Officer, Cadw, Natural Resources Wales, Dyfed Archaeological Trust (DAT) and the Authority's Ecologist, none of whom objected to the application. DAT had recommended that their standard condition regarding a written scheme of investigation applied. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.



The Chair noted that Dr R Plummer, as she had not been able to attend the meeting, had commented in an email on the absence of responses from Cadw and DAT, however this concern had now been addressed. In response to a question from another Member, it was confirmed that there would be no works above ground, with the pumping equipment being located in one of the existing storage tanks. The route of the rising main from the walled garden to the main road would be in the same trench as, and underneath, the existing electrical cable which would minimise the impact on the Scheduled area of the site. A Section 104 Adoption Agreement would be made with Welsh Water regarding connection to the main sewer, and Pembrokeshire County Council approved contractors would be used to do the section of the work on the public highway.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans and archaeology.

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.

It was also reported that a “protocol letter” had been received from solicitors acting for NoPI St Davids Ltd (in formation) a company formed by the group campaigning against the development at Glasfryn Road, St Davids which included a hotel proposed to be operated by Premier Inn. The Solicitor advised that the letter, which set out reasons why it was considered the decision was defective, was with the legal team for consideration. A response was in preparation and the pre-action protocol rules required a reply from the Authority by the 28th January. If the prospective claimants decided to make an application for Judicial Review after considering the authority’s reply it would for the court to decide in the first instance if there was an arguable case and that the Judicial review should be given leave to proceed. If proceedings were served and leave given then it was likely to be several months before the case was heard, in all likelihood in Cardiff.

NOTED.

[Having disclosed an interest in the following item, Councillor P Baker tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture.]



8. Other Planning Matters

a) Tree Preservation Order 138 Aber Hescwm

It was reported that following a request that trees at Aber Hescwm be considered for a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), TPO 136 was implemented on 31st January 2018. It was subsequently decided not to confirm the order because the review period had identified amendments and additions to the plan and schedule which were beyond the scope of what was deemed acceptable under the TPO modification guidance. The current TPO, TPO 138 was implemented on 31st July 2018 and this included those amendments. One letter had been received which proposed modifications, and the report commented on the issues raised.

Although the visual aesthetics of a tree or trees was subjective, the objective guidelines for implementing a Tree Preservation Order were all sufficiently met by the group in question, taking into account criteria relating to visibility, individual and wider impact. Officers considered that the trees and Woodlands could be protected as they met the criteria for inclusion of a TPO which would retain these trees for their local historical importance. It was therefore recommended that Tree Preservation Order 138 be confirmed with modifications to remove T14, reposition T13 and reduce the spread of the south eastern end of W3.

It was **RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 138 be confirmed with modifications to remove T14, reposition T13 and reduce the spread of the south eastern end of W3.

b) Tree Preservation Order 139 Barbeque Lawn, Saundersfoot

It was reported that, following numerous requests from members of the public, together with receipt of a pre-application for this site, Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 135 had been implemented on 31st January 2018. However it had been decided not to confirm the order because official documents relevant to the Order had been misplaced and the Authority was unable to consider the order fully with regards to consultation correspondence and the Order as a whole. To ensure that the Order was fully considered by the Authority, TPO 135 was not confirmed and was superseded through implementation of TPO 139 on 31st July 2018. All relevant parties were given the opportunity to re-comment on the proposed TPO.

The Development Management Team Leader noted that protecting the trees through a TPO would not preclude development of the area, but would give the trees a greater status.

Officers considered that the trees made a significant contribution to the character of the area and provided visual amenity to the village and harbour. Although the visual aesthetics of a tree or trees was subjective,



the objective guidelines for implementing a Tree Preservation Order were all sufficiently met by the group in question, taking into account criteria relating to visibility, individual and wider impact. Officers considered that the trees could be protected as they met the criteria for inclusion of a TPO and highlighted their local historical importance and visual amenity. It was therefore recommended that Tree Preservation Order 139 be confirmed.

It was **RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 139 be confirmed.

c) Tree Preservation Order 140 The Coach House, Y Cwcell, Tyddewi

It was reported that a Conservation Area notification had been received for removal of Hawthorn Tree which officers deemed to be worthy of retention as it made a significant contribution to the character of the area and provided visual amenity. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) had been placed on the tree, based on the guidance in Technical Advice Note 10.

One letter of objection had been received raising concerns regarding view and light and the health and safety hazard to the wider public. Comments on these objections were provided in the report.

Although the visual aesthetics of a tree or trees was subjective, the objective guidelines for implementing a Tree Preservation Order were all sufficiently met by the tree in question, taking into account criteria relating to visibility, individual and wider impact. Officers considered that the tree could be protected as it met the criteria for inclusion of a TPO and would retain the tree for its visual amenity. It was therefore recommended that Tree Preservation Order 140 be confirmed.

It was **RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 140 be confirmed.

d) Tree Preservation Order 141 St Ishmaels Green

It was reported that following a site visit, the area immediately surrounding the village green in St Ishmaels was assessed in regards to TPO legislation. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was implemented on 31st July 2018 and 1 letter of support and 3 letters of objection were received as a result of public consultation. The issues raised were set out in the report, together with officers' comments on these. The Development Management Team Leader again noted that with regards to the comments relating to leaves and concerns about overhanging branches, confirmation of the TPO would not preclude work to manage the trees in future.

Although the visual aesthetics of a tree or trees was subjective, the objective guidelines for implementing a Tree Preservation Order were all sufficiently met by the trees in question, taking into account criteria



relating to visibility, individual and wider impact. Officers considered that the trees could be protected as they met the criteria for inclusion of a TPO and would retain them for their visual amenity. It was therefore recommended that Tree Preservation Order 141 be confirmed.

It was **RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 141 be confirmed.



