

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

6 March 2019

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

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

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 12.50pm]

## 1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P Baker, Mrs G Hayward and Mrs J James.

## 2. Disclosures of interest

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

<b>Application and Reference</b>	<b>Member(s)/Officer(s)</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
<i>Minutes 6(a)below</i> NP/NP/18/0335/FUL 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 –	Councillor M Evans	Disclosed a personal and prejudicial interest. Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed



Fishguard Bay Camping  
& Caravan Park,  
Fishguard

*Minutes 6(b)below*  
NP/18/0610/FUL  
Residential development  
of 38 houses (27 open  
market houses & 11  
affordable) - Land  
opposite Bush Terrace,  
Jameston, Tenby,  
Pembrokeshire

Councillor P Kidney

Disclosed a  
personal interest.  
Remained in the  
room and played a  
full part in the  
discussion and  
voting thereon.

*Minutes 6(c)below*  
NP/18/0622/FUL  
Proposed mixed-use  
development comprising  
of 32 open market units,  
7 affordable units, rural  
enterprise units, biomass  
district heating system,  
sewage treatment  
system & associated  
infrastructure upgrades –  
Home Farm, Broad  
Lane, Lawrenny, Kilgetty

Councillor Mrs D  
Clements

Disclosed a  
personal and  
prejudicial interest.  
Withdrew from the  
meeting while the  
application was  
discussed

## **NOTED.**

### **3. Minutes**

- (a) The minutes of the meeting held on the 23 January 2019 were presented for confirmation and signature.

With regard to Item 2, Disclosures of Interest, Mr Sangster noted that while he remained in the meeting when the Tree Preservation Order at Barbeque Lawn, Saundersfoot was discussed, he did not vote on the matter.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 23 January 2019 be confirmed and signed subject to the above amendment.

- (b) The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2019 were presented for confirmation and signature.



It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 4 February 2019 be confirmed and signed.

#### 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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(a) refers</i>	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 – Fishguard Bay Camping & Caravan Park, Fishguard	Alex Rees- Wigmore National Trust - Objector Mark Whitehouse - Applicant
NP/18/0610/FUL <i>Minute 6(b) refers</i>	Residential development of 38 houses (27 open market houses & 11 affordable) - Land opposite Bush Terrace, Jameston, Tenby, Pembrokeshire	Mary Sinclair CPRW – Objector Harry Thomas, applicant
NP/18/0747/FUL <i>Minute 6(d) refers</i>	Demolition of former Reeves Calendars & Five Arches Press Offices and	Mr Richard Bowen - Agent



the redevelopment of the site for 29 residential dwellings (Affordable Housing). Including landscaping and associated infrastructure works. - Former Printing Factory, Knowling Mead, Tenby

NP/18/0756/FUL <i>Minute 6(e)</i> <i>Refers</i>	Conversion of Dutch barn into a two storey dwelling - Norchard Barns, Boulston, Haverfordwest	James Nutting - Applicant
NP/19/0031/ADV <i>Minute 6(f)</i> <i>Refers</i>	2 x temporary information signs – Land at Upper Burrows, Freshwater East	Mr Tim Jones, PCNPA - Applicant

## 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.

The Chair reminded Members that, as noted in paragraph 12 of the Solicitor's report, anyone leaving the room during the debate on an item would not be permitted to vote on that matter.

**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*):

*[Having disclosed an interest in the following application, Councillor M Evans withdrew from the meeting while it was considered.]*



- (a) 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

The Chair drew Members' attention to the fact that a replacement report relating to this application had been circulated to them prior to the meeting.

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the meeting of the Committee held in December 2018 when it had been resolved that consideration of the application be deferred and the site inspected by the Committee. The site inspection had been carried out on 4 February 2019.

It was reported that planning permission was sought for alterations to provide a new access to an existing camping and caravan park, increase the site area and change the existing permission for 50 static caravans, 20 touring caravans and 30 tents to 91 lodge-style caravans. In addition the proposal included a new shop and reception area, new tractor shed, sales/display for 2 units, staff and visitor parking area, new restaurant, areas for LPG storage and electricity transformer, minor alterations to existing road layouts, together with provision of new access roads within the extended site area and associated external works.

The officer noted that the Authority's Access Manager had advised that if Members were minded to approve the application, it would be necessary to divert the Coast Path prior to the commencement of any work on site and this would be covered by an informative. Since writing the report, further letters of objection had been received from Natural Resources Wales, the National Trust and members of the public raising issues of increased density on the site; impacts on ecology, habitat, landscape character and the integrity of the coastal slope; the skyline nature of the development; the doubling of the size of the site; inaccuracies in the additional landscape statement submitted; harm to the quality of the National Park; and the visual impact on the coast path. Photographs taken by officers of the Authority and Natural Resources Wales were shown which indicated that the surrounding landscape had not been



adequately assessed in the landscape statement, with a failure to consider the impact of the skyline development, the additional built form and the restaurant building on the cliff top.

The first of two speakers was Alex Rees-Wigmore on behalf of the National Trust. He noted that this was an undeveloped stretch of coast and believed that the National Park was created to protect such coastline from development. He pointed out that this was not small scale development, but a doubling of the size of the existing site from 50 static caravans to 91 lodges. The Coast Path which went through the site was the main driver for tourism in the County, bringing considerable economic benefits, and that people walked it to enjoy the wildness and beauty of the coast, not to walk through a built up area. Mr Rees-Wigmore explained that the National Trust-owned land bordered the site to the south west and from it there were views back towards Dinas Head which would be altered by this proposed development. Other viewpoints would be blocked and the site would be prominent from other locations, such as Pen Anglas north of Goodwick; he considered that in terms of landscape and visual assessment, the proposed development would cause major adverse landscape harm. With regard to the physical development of the site, it was noted that no details had been provided, and given that there were significant differences in levels, Mr Rees-Wigmore suggested that rock blasting might be necessary in order to create a flat site. In summary he believed that the application was completely at odds with the ethos of the National Park, would destroy habitat and risk damaging the coastline. He feared that approval would set a precedent for development in other parts of the National Park with landowners ceasing to manage habitats and then bringing forward applications for inappropriate development. He asked that the application be refused.

The second speaker was Mark Whitehouse, the applicant. Thanking Members for attending the site visit, Mr Whitehouse said that he understood the responsibility held by the Committee as he held a sense of responsibility for the provision of high quality tourist accommodation of which he believed there was a shortage. He had identified a shift in the market as traditional caravan and camping no longer appealed to many people and he therefore proposed luxury lodges in a unique setting. He pointed out that he had permission for 100 pitches, in total, for static caravans, touring caravans and tents and there would therefore be a reduction in overall numbers and density through the provision of 91 high-end lodges. These were more spacious and were often rented out by their owners to third parties. He also believed that the quality of the lodges proposed would have a beneficial effect on the local housing stock, with the lodges being bought in preference to second homes. He added that 30 direct full time jobs would be created and that the business would continue to engage with the local community.



Turning to the Visual Impact Report which he had commissioned, this demonstrated that as the lodges replaced existing caravans on the site, it would blend in better to the landscape and become less obtrusive. He added that the impact of the proposed restaurant could be mitigated by making this single storey, and that if this was a concern to members they could deal with it by a condition. With regard to traffic, most staff would not be on site after dark and car sharing was promoted to reduce the amount of traffic on site. There would also be a reduction in towed vehicles – Mr Whitehouse disputed the assertion by officers that there would be a corresponding increase in towed boats. He stated that the S106 Agreement regarding a transportation contribution had been signed, although the Highway Authority had not been prepared to guarantee that the contribution would be spent on the road. In conclusion, Mr Whitehouse stated that the development would improve the site by providing additional landscaping, the new lodges would blend in better than the existing caravans, of which there would be a reduction in number. Visitor spend would be increased through the provision of year round tourism. He therefore hoped that the Committee would support the application.

Members sought clarification regarding the number of additional jobs to be created by the development and were advised by the applicant that it was anticipated that an additional 14 jobs would be created to make 30 full time jobs in total. They also asked about the suggestion by the applicant that the two storey restaurant could become single storey, however the officer advised that the application had to be determined as it had been submitted, which was with a two storey restaurant.

The Solicitor requested clarification as to whether a section 106 unilateral undertaking had been received and whether the same required expenditure of monies received on improvements to the access road. Officers confirmed that a completed unilateral undertaking regarding the highway payment had not been received by the Authority. However he believed that following a conversation with the Highway Authority that money received through such an undertaking would be spent on the road leading to the site. Whilst there was no tie in the undertaking to the access road, he had no reason to believe that the money, if received, would be spent in any other location.

In response to another question, the officer confirmed that no response had been received from Fishguard and Goodwick Town Council.

Thanking officers for an informative site visit, one Member noted that although he appreciated the site could be visually intrusive, he considered that this would be outweighed by the provision of 30 full time jobs. There



had been no objection locally and the application had been supported by the local Member and the Community Council. This was a huge investment by the company, and the colour of the new lodges would make the development less intrusive. He therefore said that he would support the application.

Other Members acknowledged that the new lodges would create a year round tourist facility and would be less obtrusive than the existing caravans, however they could not support the application as they considered that the extent of the increase in the number of units and the two storey nature and visual intrusion of the restaurant were too great; the benefits to the economy did not outweigh the environmental harm. They also pointed out that the Authority had a clear policy relating to camping and caravan sites, to which this application was contrary and that it also contravened several other policies in the Local Development Plan including those which sought to protect natural beauty and cultural heritage, remoteness and tranquillity, visual intrusion and mitigate light pollution. The overwhelming importance of the coastal landscape and seascape to the County was also noted.

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

- 1. Policies 35 and 38 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan state extension to existing holiday sites will not be permitted in the National Park. The additional 41 lodge-style static caravans and their associated development in an open countryside location is therefore contrary to adopted Local Development Plan Policy.**
- 2. Policies 1, 8, 9, 15, and 30 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 fails to incorporate traditional features, and 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, 9, 15 and 30 of the adopted Local Development Plan Policy and Supplementary Planning Guidance on Landscape Character Assessment and Seascape Character Assessment.**
- 3. Insufficient information has been submitted in respect of highway repairs and improvements in the form of a legal agreement to allow the local planning authority to properly mitigate against the impact**





of the development on highway and pedestrian safety. The application is therefore contrary to Policy 53 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park adopted Local Development Plan (2010).

4. **Policy 10 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan seeks to protect nature conservation values of a local nature reserve or other sites of local nature conservation interest, or the main features of interest within a regionally important geodiversity site, development will only be permitted if the importance of the development outweighs the local value of the site and mitigation, minimisation or of off-setting has been investigated. The proposed development is not considered to outweigh the local habitat value and the mitigation proposed on the scheme is also not considered to restore or enhance the nature conservation value of this site within the National Park. Therefore, the current proposal is considered to be liable to significantly harm the nature conservation value of the site and is contrary to Local Development Plan Policy 10 (Local Sites of Nature Conservation or Geological Interest).**

*[Councillor A Wilcox tended his apologies and left the meeting during consideration of the following item.]*

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

It was reported that this application sought full planning permission for the erection of 11 affordable houses and 27 open market houses. It was therefore a major application and for this reason was before the Committee. The site, which had been allocated within the Local Development Plan for 35 units, would be served by two entrances, one for the affordable and the other for the open market houses. The affordable element was to be built and operated by *ateb* and was located in the north east corner of the development. An area of open space would link through to the open market section of the site with a condition suggested to ensure that the links through the site were in place before the affordable housing was occupied.

Members were reminded that a site inspection had taken place on 4 February 2019 to allow the Committee to view the site and its surroundings prior to consideration of the planning application. They were also reminded that Access Officer's comments printed in the report were



an earlier draft, and that the correct version had since been circulated to all Members.

It was reported at the meeting that the figure on page 75 of the report referring to the Highway contribution of £19,000 had been replaced by a revised consultation response requiring £13,500 as the calculation had initially been based on all dwellings rather than the open market dwellings only. In addition to that, contributions for public open space provision/play equipment and community facilities and public libraries would be expected. An additional letter of objection from an adjoining neighbour had been received and this had been circulated to Members, however the relevant material planning considerations had already been dealt with in the report. A further letter received that morning referred to the space available for oil and gas tanks, however it was understood that these would be placed underground.

The officer also noted that the red line of the application had recently been altered to include the area proposed for drainage at the southern and eastern end of the site. The scheme suggested that a bridge be constructed to allow the public footpath to cross this 1.2m deep swale however discussions with the agent had resulted in a suggestion that culverted pipes at this location would have a lesser impact. An additional condition was suggested to require cross sections and culvert/bridge details to be provided. No objections to the amended plans had been received from Dyfed Archaeological Trust, the Authority's Ecologist, Dŵr Cymru/Welsh Water or the Community Council, although the latter maintained their objection to the application as a whole. No response had yet been received from Cadw.

A landscaping plan was currently being prepared by the applicants and this would address all boundary treatments.

The officer concluded that the scale, design, layout and density of the development were considered to be appropriate on this allocated site and within the village setting. It was noted that the recommendation in the report should have been one of delegated approval, subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 Agreement and the response of Cadw, and subject to conditions as set out, with an additional condition regarding the bridge/culvert and amendment to condition 31 to include the landscaping of the public footpath and to include the gas tanks in the hard landscaping condition.

The first of two speakers was Mary Sinclair, Chair of Pembrokeshire Branch of the Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (CPRW) and also speaking for local residents. She began by saying that the site notices had not been seen and that only the pre-application consultation



notices were still in place which was worrying. Mrs Sinclair noted that the application site fell in a narrow belt of landscape between the coast and The Ridgeway. She had identified two problems – firstly there was a shortfall of housing in the area and the Authority did not have a policy which prevented newly built housing being sold as second homes. Secondly, the site had been allocated using an outdated land classification and consequently its development was contrary to Welsh Government Policy regarding use of the best and most versatile farmland as set out in a circular letter in 2017. The land in question was shown on the relevant map as grade 3a which should be protected for food production.

With regard to the existing wall on the site, Mrs Sinclair stated that this was not just a pile of stones, and should be retained as it was a distinguishing characteristic of the area. Also a belt of trees was needed to soften the appearance of the development which appeared as a stark line of homes when viewed from the south. She noted there was no provision for a children's play area and no safe walking route to the nearby school. She was disappointed that there was no inclusion renewable energy features such as solar panels on the dwellings and that the gardens were not large enough for food to be grown. She also noted that local residents feared there was insufficient capacity for sewage. She concluded by saying that the land should be kept for future generations as there was no extraordinary reason for its development at this time.

The officer clarified that the Welsh Government Circular on the Best and Most Versatile agricultural land did not apply to Development Plan allocations in retrospect and also that she herself had erected a site notice.

The second speaker was the applicant, Harry Thomas. He explained that he was a small local developer, and the only way for him to bring forward affordable housing on the site was to gift the land to *ateb*, for them to take on that element of the scheme. It was therefore not possible to 'pepper' the affordable housing throughout the site. However being a local company, they used local tradesmen and builders merchants which meant that the revenue stayed in Pembrokeshire. He also noted that the site would be built gradually over a period of time. Mr Thomas referred to the site at May Park also in Jameston which he had been building for a number of years and advised that none of the properties on that estate, which would be finished this year, were holiday lets or second homes. Mr Thomas confirmed for Members that he employed one person full time and many subcontractors.

One of the Members then read out a letter from Manorbier Community Council, which considered that most of the points it had raised previously



had not been considered fairly. It noted that following a meeting attended by 30 local residents, the main area of concern had been the lack of a footpath to the Baptist Church which would allow children to walk to school, as encouraged by government policy. Given that 47 dwellings could be built on 3 sites in the village and the Local Development Plan Inspector's report had referred to an extension of the existing site, this could mean up to 80 new dwellings in the village, with no footpath to the school, or even certainty that a crossing to Bush Terrace would be provided. The community was not against the development, however they did want a footpath to the school.

Other Members agreed that a footpath or crossing should be provided, given the traffic that travelled on the road into Tenby during the summer. The officer replied that the conditions required by the Highway Authority had been included in full in her report, however this development was not of a size which would require such a footpath to be provided. Another Member asked whether haulage routes were a concern on narrow roads in the area and the officer replied that a Construction Management Scheme could be required as a condition to deal with that concern.

The other main concern expressed by Members was that the affordable housing was not distributed throughout the site, but rather was concentrated in one area which it was considered would create a 'them and us' situation. This situation was exacerbated by the dwellings being serviced by a separate entrance. They also asked if there were sufficient safeguards to ensure that the properties were made available to local people. The officer replied that *ateb* worked with the local housing authority and operated a cascade system which would ensure that local people in housing need would have the highest priority.

Turning to the concerns raised by an objector that a number of houses would back onto her property, a Member asked why the gardens could not be made bigger. The officer replied that a condition regarding landscaping as well as one removing permitted development rights had been included. The distance between the properties was 28 metres from the rear wall of the objector's property which was considered to be an acceptable distance and would not have an unreasonable impact on amenity.

Notwithstanding the above, Members were pleased to see the development of a housing allocation being realised and the recommendation of delegation subject to the conditions set out in the report and raised in the meeting was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to grant planning permission subject to no adverse comments from Cadw**



and the completion of the S106 Agreements in respect of the provision of affordable housing and contributions in respect of highways, public open space provision/play equipment and community facilities and public libraries within 3 months of the meeting. If not received within that time, officers could refuse the application. The application was also subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, foul/surface water drainage, permitted development, landscaping scheme, boundary treatment, ground levels, samples of materials, provision of open space and a footpath link prior to occupation of the affordable dwellings, highways, parking and turning, lighting, undergrounding of cables, footpath diversion, ecology and biodiversity, the bridge/culvert. and a construction management plan to include phasing.

*The Committee adjourned between 11.30am and 11.40am.*

*[Having disclosed an interest, Councillor Mrs D Clements withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the following item.]*

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/18/0622/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Lort-Phillips, Lawrenny Developments Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Proposed mixed-use development comprising of 32 open market units, 7 affordable units, rural enterprise units, biomass district heating system, sewage treatment system & associated infrastructure upgrades  
LOCATION: Home Farm, Broad Lane, Lawrenny, Kilgetty

It was reported that this application was a major development and was of public interest. As such it was requested that Members consider a Site Visit to allow the Committee to view the site and its surroundings prior to consideration of the application at a subsequent meeting. A site visit was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow the Committee to undertake a Site Inspection.**

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/18/0747/FUL  
APPLICANT: Jones Brothers (Henllan) Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of former Reeves Calendars & Five Arches Press Offices and the redevelopment of the site for 29 residential dwellings (Affordable Housing). Including landscaping and associated infrastructure works.  
LOCATION: Former Printing Factory, Knowling Mead, Tenby

It was reported that this application was reported to the Committee as it was classed as major development.



Planning approval was sought for the demolition of these buildings and the redevelopment of the site for 29 residential dwellings (affordable housing). The proposal also included landscaping and associated infrastructure works. Officers considered that the development would provide new residential properties while sustaining the local character and not impacting on privacy or amenity of neighbours.

It was reported at the meeting that outstanding consultation responses had been received from Tenby Town Council, which supported the application, and Welsh Water which had indicated its support subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to the sewer and waste water disposal. A letter of objection, which had been circulated to Members, had also been received since writing the report, raising concerns regarding access, pedestrian safety, sewage capacity and contamination. A tree report had also been submitted by the agent that the officer considered addressed most of the requirements set out in Condition 16 of the report. It was therefore recommended that the application be delegated to officers to grant planning permission subject to the completion of S106 Agreements in respect of provision of affordable housing and footpath improvements and conditions as set out in the report, those required by Welsh Water and the amendment to condition 16 which now only required details of landscaping to be provided.

There was one speaker on this application, the agent, Richard Bowen. He wished only to clarify some points, following discussions earlier in the meeting, and to answer any questions raised by Members. He explained that the development comprised 29 affordable units which would be social rented properties, operated by *ateb* (subject to agreement) in line with Welsh Government housing requirements. The method of allocation would be a housing cascade based on local need. A construction management traffic scheme would be provided in accordance with the conditions, as well as a construction method statement for demolition of the properties which would protect the amenity of local residents. He clarified for Members that as part of the application, the access would be improved and would segregate pedestrians and vehicles. There would also be liaison and consultation with local residents regarding demolition, construction and minimising disruption to their access arrangements.

Members were supportive of the application, considering the layout and provision of parking to be good and emphasising the need for affordable housing in the town. However, there were concerns regarding access during the demolition and construction phases as parking for residents of the adjoining dwellings was already difficult. It was requested that due consideration be given to protect nearby residents in preparing the Construction Traffic Management Plan and to avoid deliveries while children were walking along the footpath to and from nearby schools.



Other Members asked about the retention of trees and footpath provision. The officer confirmed that a planning obligation had been requested to extend the width of the existing footpath, and a revised tree report had been received which retained some trees; details of proposed landscaping would be required as part of the conditions.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to grant planning permission subject to the completion of S106 Agreements in respect of provision of affordable housing and footpath improvements within 3 months of the date of the meeting and if not received within that timeframe officers could refuse the application. The application was also subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, surface water, finishes, Construction Traffic Management Plan, parking and turning, road surfaces, contamination, reptile mitigation strategy, removal of permitted development rights, undergrounding of cables, landscaping scheme and conditions required by Welsh Water.**

*[Councillor M Evans and Dr R Heath Davies tendered their apologies and left the meeting at this juncture]*

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/18/0756/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr S Nutting  
PROPOSAL: Conversion of dutch barn into a two storey dwelling  
LOCATION: Norchard Barns, Boulston, Haverfordwest

It was reported that the application was before the Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the views of the Community Council.

It was reported that this structure was an existing steel frame barn, commonly known as a Dutch barn. The existing barn had a two storey form and was currently used for storage, with the adjacent stone barns already converted for residential/holiday accommodation uses. Planning permission was sought for its conversion into a two storey dwelling with upside down configuration for the accommodation. Externally there were parking and turning areas with separate bin store including a mix of hard and soft landscaping.

It was reported at the meeting that three further letters of objection had been received expressing concern regarding highway safety, however this matter was covered in the report.

The officer advised that Policy 14 of the Local Development Plan regarding the protection of buildings of local importance was relevant in this instance as the Authority's Building Conservation Officer had advised



that given the condition of the barn and the increasing rarity of this type of building in the landscape, this was a building of local importance worthy of protection and reuse, and its conversion to residential was considered acceptable in this instance. The building made a positive contribution to the character of the area and was of intrinsic architectural merit. The development was not considered to have an adverse impact on the National Park and a completed unilateral undertaking providing a contribution to affordable housing provision had now been received. It was therefore recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report.

Mr James Nutting, the agent, then addressed the Committee. He said he had listened to the concerns of the Community Council and wished to clarify some issues. He explained that his client and family had lived in the parish for 30 years and had connections with the people and buildings there. They had made efforts to enhance their property, working with the National Park, through the removal of concrete and other agricultural buildings, with their commitment demonstrated through previous renovation projects. They recognised the unique and special nature of the Dutch barn, however there were ongoing difficulties of maintenance and it was becoming uneconomic – a reason for the disappearance of these structures from the National Park.

He believed that the proposals conserved the character of the building through retention of the original form, with windows and doors kept to a minimum and these set behind timber boarding with glazed sides. It was intended that the boarding would break up any light pollution. The barn's conversion to a modern family home would ensure its future. The tranquillity of the area would not deteriorate and would be enhanced as this was the reason why people wanted to live in the area. There would be minimal additional traffic due to the small size of the building and it was noted that two vehicles were already parked outside the barn which therefore had adequate parking and turning. It was proposed to install a mesh system on the ground at the entrance to the site and visibility from this was good. Historically the roads had deteriorated due to agricultural traffic, however the roads needed to be maintained for all residents. Mr Nutting confirmed that sewage would be disposed of via a septic tank and the supply of water and removal of any asbestos were the responsibilities of the applicant.

It was noted that some late letters of objection to this application had been circulated to the Committee.

One Member sought clarification why this application was not covered by the Authority's transport/travel accessibility policy and was considered suitable for development when other applications in similar rural locations





only allowed development for affordable or holiday use. Officers explained that as this building was classed as one of local importance and is considered worthy of retention, this is held in higher regard in policy terms than the accessibility issue.

The officer's recommendation was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, light mitigation, Bat mitigation, removal of permitted development rights, undergrounding of cables, photographic survey, sample of materials, details of bin store and accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement.**

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/19/0031/ADV  
APPLICANT: Mr T Jones, South Warden Manager  
PROPOSAL: 2 x temporary information signs  
LOCATION: Land at Upper Burrows, Freshwater East

It was reported that the application was before the Committee as the applicant was the National Park Authority. Advertisement consent was sought for the erection of two free standing temporary information signs. The advertisement would be bilingual and would highlight the criminal act that took place at the application site where several trees protected by an order had been cut down without any consent. The signs were proposed for a temporary period between 1 April – 31 October 2019.

Consideration had been given to issues of visual impact and public safety. While it was acknowledged that there would be an impact while the signs were in position, this was entirely reversible. As the signs were not near a highway, there were no safety concerns.

The applicant, Mr Tim Jones of PCNPA, was present to answer Members' questions.

Members expressed views on the detailed wording on the signs and commented upon the actions that had led to the need for the signs, but were reminded that their remit for consideration of the application was limited to visual impact and public safety. It was also suggested that a temporary permission would be appropriate.

The officer's recommendation was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to issue consent subject to a condition limiting the period of the advertisement and the standard advertisement conditions.**



## 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 reported that decisions were appended to the report for the retrospective change of use & proposed extension of former Goat Shed/Office to holiday cottage at Pen y Mynydd Uchaf, Dinas Cross which had been dismissed, and the material change of use of the building to use for residential purposes at the Anti U Boat Listening Station, Garn Fawr, Nr Strumble Head which was allowed. The main reason for this was that Cadw had written during the appeal to advise that the building was of significant importance and worthy of listing, having previously not taken the opportunity to list the building. Following the decision officers had written to Cadw to request that the building be listed, however there had been no response. Members asked the officer to pursue Cadw on this matter and to emphasise to them the Committee's support for such action.

Members were reminded that at the last meeting of the Committee, they had been advised that the Authority had received a Protocol letter 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 and residential development.. The officer reported that NoPI, having received the response from the Authority's Barrister, had decided not to submit an application for Judicial Review.

**NOTED.**

## 8. Other Planning Matters – Tree Preservation Order 143 – Nyth y Dryw, Heol Crwys, Trefin

This order related to a Sycamore tree in a dwelling curtilage adjacent to the boundary with Heol Crwys; the tree was considered to make a significant contribution to the character of the area and provided visual amenity. It was reported that a Conservation Area notification had been made seeking to dismantle the tree to ground level, leaving the stump in situ to allow regrowth, however a site visit by the Tree and Landscape officer had identified it as meriting a TPO.

A petition of objection had been received in response to consultation and the issues raised were set out in the report. The officer's recommendation was moved and seconded.

It was **RESOLVED** that Tree Preservation Order 143 be confirmed.

