

# Development Management Committee

1 February 2023

## Present (In Person)

Dr M Havard (Chair)

Councillor Steve Alderman, Councillor Mrs D Clements, Mrs S Hoss, Councillor R Jordan, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor PJ Morgan, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor Mrs S Skyrme-Blackhall, Councillor Mrs V Thomas Councillor Mrs M Wiggins and Councillor C Williams

## Present (Remotely)

Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Councillor R Owens, and Councillor A Wilcox.

[Dr R Heath-Davies joined the meeting virtually during the Disclosures of Interest (Minute 2 refers)]

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock and Virtually 10.00am – 12.15pm;  
1.10pm - 3.55pm]

### 1. **Apologies**

There were no apologies for absence.

### 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>
Minute 6 below – general declaration as an NRW Board Member and Plantlife Trustee	Dr RM Plummer	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting
Minute 6(c) below NP/21/0085/FUL - Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement. – Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepside	Councillor V Thomas	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting



<p>Minute 6(d) below NP/22/0569/FUL Change of use (retrospective) to allow building to be used Under Class A3 for retail, sales and public seating for use relating to Harbwr Brewery. – Bath Store, Sergeants Lane, Tenby</p>	<p>Dr RM Plummer Councillor R Jordan Councillor M James Councillor S Skyrme- Blackhall Councillor V Thomas Mrs J James Councillor S Alderman Dr R Heath-Davies Councillor A Wilcox Councillor D Clements Councillor V Thomas Mr G Jones Dr M Havard Councillor Dr S Hancock</p>	<p>Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting</p>
<p>Minute 6(e) below NP/22/563/FUL - Retrospective change of use of southern building and stable yard. Alterations to roofs, including insertion of roof-lights – Stables Building and stable yard, Sergeants Lane, Tenby</p>	<p>Dr RM Plummer Councillor R Jordan Councillor M James Councillor S Skyrme- Blackhall Councillor V Thomas Mrs J James Councillor S Alderman Dr R Heath-Davies Councillor A Wilcox Councillor D Clements Councillor V Thomas Mr G Jones Dr M Havard Councillor Dr S Hancock</p>	<p>Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting</p>
<p>Minute 6(f) below NP/564/LBA - Alterations of roofs and wall-plates and reinstatement of slated finish. Insertion of roof-lights. Alterations and restoration of glazing and doors – Stables Building and stable yard, Sergeants Lane, Tenby</p>	<p>Dr RM Plummer Councillor R Jordan Councillor M James Councillor S Skyrme- Blackhall Councillor V Thomas Mrs J James Councillor S Alderman Dr R Heath-Davies Councillor A Wilcox Councillor D Clements</p>	<p>Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting</p>



Councillor V Thomas  
Mr G Jones  
Dr M Havard  
Councillor Dr S  
Hancock

Minute 6(g) below NP/22/0217/FUL Proposed holiday let/ Air B&B accommodation – 6 Clement Terrace, Tenby	Councillor S Skyrme- Blackhall	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting
--	-----------------------------------	--

### 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 7 December 2022 and the 18 January 2023 were presented for confirmation and signature.

One Member noted from the minutes that clarification of the reasons for going against the officer recommendation on NP/22/0483/FUL had been given after the decision had been taken and asked that greater care was taken in future to ensure such reasons were provided prior to the vote.

Councillor C Williams asked that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December recorded that he took no part in the discussion on NP/22/0388/FUL (Kenmore) and abstained from voting.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on 7 December 2022 and the 18 January 2023 be confirmed and signed subject to the above amendment.

### 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, amended 16 June 2021, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak unless they had spoken on the same application previously when they would have 3 minutes in which to present new information (*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/22/0424/FUL Minute 6(a) refers	Demolition of existing residential dwelling and construction of new	Anna Williamson – Objectors Agent – online



	house and garage - Ringstone, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3JP	Gareth Havard – Community Council – online Dr Mary O'Regan – supporter Ms Terresa Bowen – Applicant
NP/22/0240/FUL Minute 6(b) refers	The proposed demolition of the modern farm buildings, and the construction of a replacement new build dwelling including, in part, the conversion of existing historic barns, landscaping, solar panel array, bat night roost and associated works – Lower Ripperston Farm, St. Brides, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3AH	Cllr Peter Smithies – Community Council Geraint John – Agent
NP/21/0085/FUL Minute 6(c) refers	Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement. – Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepside, Narberth, Pembrokeshire, SA67 8NS	Mr Dorian Evans – objector County Councillor Alex Cormack – Amroth Community Council Geraint John – Agent
NP/22/0569/FUL Minute 6(d) refers	Change of use (retrospective) to allow building to be used Under Class A3 for retail, sales and public seating for use relating to Harbwr Brewery. –	Mr Ted Lewis – objector Mike Evans – Applicant



Bath Store, Sergeants  
Lane, Tenby,  
Pembrokeshire, SA70  
7BQ

NP/22/563/FUL Minute 6(e) refers	Retrospective change of use of southern building and stable yard. Alterations to roofs, including insertion of roof-lights – Stables Building and stable yard, Sergeants Lane, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7BQ	Mike Evans – Applicant
NP/22/0564/LBA Minute 6(f) refers	Alterations of roofs and wall-plates and reinstatement of slated finish. Insertion of roof- lights. Alterations and restoration of glazing and doors – Stables Building and stable yard, Sergeants Lane, Tenby, SA70 7BQ	Mike Evans – Applicant
NP/22/0217/FUL Minute 6(g) refers	Proposed holiday let/ Air B&B accommodation – 6 Clement Terrace, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7LA	Ceri Davies – on behalf of Applicant/Agent

## 5. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, with particular focus on the purposes and duty of the National Park. It went on to outline the purpose of the planning system and relevant considerations in decision making, and the Solicitor added that consideration also needed to be given to the National Development Framework - Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 adopted by the Welsh Government on 24 February 2021 as well as its own Local Development Plan 2. The report also noted that the Authority also had a duty to carry out sustainable development, ecological considerations which included the role of the Environment Wales Act 2016, 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*):

[Councillor A Wilcox was not present for all of the discussion on the following application]

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/22/0424/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms T Bowen  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing residential dwelling and construction of new house and garage  
LOCATION: Ringstone, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when it was deferred to allow the Committee to undertake a site inspection (Minute 3b) refers).

It was reported that the existing dwelling was a 4-bed dormer bungalow built in 1974 that had been substantially extended and modified since its original construction. It was immediately adjacent to a set of four dwellings to the west. The application sought demolition of the existing property and its replacement with a two-storey dwelling, albeit of a slightly larger mass, scale and form.

The report noted that a replacement dwelling at this location was considered acceptable in principle, and its scale and height appropriate for the site, and its context within the surrounding development was not considered to result in any overbearing impact on the immediate neighbours or loss of privacy or amenity. Ecology and landscape features would not be adversely affected by the development and ecological enhancement could be introduced by planning condition. There were no unacceptable drainage concerns. The development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding dwellings and the special qualities of the National Park, and the recommendation was one of approval, subject to conditions.

At the meeting, the Development Management Team Leader addressed a number of the concerns raised by objectors regarding the impact of the



development on the amenity of the adjacent property, and particularly regarding the accuracy of the plans. She explained that although revised plans had been submitted in October, the amendments had been minor in nature. Nevertheless, a re-consultation exercise had taken place, and because the minor nature of the amendments had been unclear, this had caused confusion, particularly with the Community Council, which erroneously thought it had to consider a materially different form of development to that it had already passed a supportive resolution on. She added that in future the amendments which were being consulted upon would be set out in any re-consultation of the Community Council, to aid them.

A shadow map was presented, as was a drawing supplied by the applicants showing the impact on neighbours' amenity from the 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the proposal. Photomontages were displayed showing neighbouring views. The Solicitor pointed out to Members that objectors had criticised the photo montages, and that they should not be interpreted to show a kink in the boundary wall, The officer clarified that the appearance of a kink was gained from the stitching together of photographs and that Members would recall from the site visit that the wall was straight.

She concluded that she believed Members had sufficient information before them in order to make a decision, and that the development would not cause harm to the amenity of neighbours or the special qualities of the National Park. However in order to address the concerns raised, six additional conditions were recommended, relating to ground levels, hours of demolition/construction, tree protection, a first floor bathroom window to be obscure glazed and top hung, use of the garage and use of the first floor roof, and those proposed were displayed for Members' consideration.

Given the considerable amount of correspondence generated by the application, the Solicitor then checked that Members had received an email from the objector dated 29 January 2023, which they confirmed, and asked some questions of clarification to the officer in relation to the report before the Committee. This established that there was considered to be a lack of overlooking from the western elevation, rather than a lack of fenestration, that the figures regarding the footprint of the proposed dwelling had been checked and that as a result of the objector's remaining dispute over the extent of the increase of the footprint, Members should reference the most recent plans to properly understand the application. The Solicitor also clarified that the plan references in condition 2 should be to the most up to date plans should planning permission be granted.

The first of three speakers was Anna Williamson, an architect speaking on



behalf of the Gardner family who lived next door to the proposed development and were concerned at the scale and proximity of the proposal directly visible from their primary habitable rooms and their only outdoor amenity. They had four main points, firstly that the proposal was too big in its context, being at least 156% larger than existing, which was a greater increase than allowed in other Welsh National Parks. She noted that the Committee had rejected the design in 2021 as it was too big and overbearing, but this design was larger still. She stated that Ringstone had been built as a bungalow to avoid some of these problems. Secondly she considered that daylight and sunlight would be lost and believed that the shadow map that had been supplied fell short of the standard independent daylight and sunlight report. As there had been no request to survey their property, she believed that the survey and model used was incorrect and incomplete. As a result, it was believed that more light would be lost than suggested.

The third point related to the impact of the development on privacy as outdoor seating areas were between 1.5m and 6m from the boundary. Ms Williamson stated that both ground floor and first floor windows overlooked the garden and first floor windows looked into the windows of habitable rooms in the neighbouring property, all without screening. She was concerned that the same incorrect and incomplete survey model had been used to consider these matters and that there would be a greater degree of overlooking and impacts on amenity than suggested.

Ms Williamson therefore concluded that as the information underpinning the application was flawed, its full impact could not be known or properly considered. She stated that there were further assumptions and errors in the officer's report, which her clients had previously asked to be corrected, and considered that their concerns had been dismissed with scant explanation. She did, however, acknowledge that some of these had been addressed by the officer in the report and at the meeting.

The agent noted that the Authority had a mission to conserve and enhance, and she believed that a replacement dwelling should make a positive contribution, not just an 'unacceptably detrimental impact', particularly when located in such a prominent position. She finished by saying that the Committee should reject the application as doing so was in accordance with National Park purposes including the Sandford Principle, and that refusal was warranted by planning policy and would be consistent with previous decisions.

Gareth Havard then addressed the Committee on behalf of the Community Council. He wished to counter the assertions made by objectors that its comments were out of time, not transparent, not objective and therefore unlawful and outlined the chronology of events.





He stated that on August 1<sup>st</sup> a consultation email had been circulated to the Havens Community Council by PCNPA requesting comments by 22<sup>nd</sup> August; the Community Council had requested a formal extension to respond to that because of the usual and quite common August recess for many councils, and the request was to allow discussion at the next Community Council meeting which was scheduled for 6<sup>th</sup> September. On August 15<sup>th</sup>, following a chasing phone call with Mr Hauser, that extension had been agreed by the Authority. On September 6<sup>th</sup> the application had been considered at the Havens Community Council meeting when both personal and public representations from both applicant and objectors were heard; residents' correspondence was also considered by the Community Council and a majority decision was made to support the application. Subsequently, on October 20<sup>th</sup>, a further consultation email had been circulated to the Community Council (CC) by the Authority requesting comment on amended plans within 14 days and that item was then set on an agenda for the next Community Council meeting scheduled for November 1<sup>st</sup>. Unfortunately, that meeting had to be cancelled at short notice because of an inquorate Council and was rescheduled for November 7<sup>th</sup>; again the Authority had been consulted on an extension to allow that discussion to take place and this had been granted. The amended plans had been considered at the meeting on November 7<sup>th</sup>, and a response submitted on the 8<sup>th</sup>, stating that the request to comment on amended plans had been discussed by the CC at its meeting the previous evening which had been attended by the applicant and representatives, plus members of the public both in favour and against the proposals. It noted that the application had attracted much local interest and that a difficult decision had not been helped by the request to comment on amended plans which it had been inferred were materially different to the original consultation response which was not the case in this instance. Nevertheless, equal opportunity had been given to all interested parties to comment on the application despite a risk of repeating debate heard at the September meeting. Two comments had been made: that the proposed plans gave rise to an oversized development and that confirmation had been sought and given by the architect present, that the boundary wall shown on the amended plans maintained existing distances from the adjacent properties, but the majority view was to support the application.

Mr Havard expressed the view of the Havens Community Council that in future when comments were sought on amended plans, it should be highlighted what amendments had actually been submitted and made clear what was expected of the consultee in response. He was pleased to hear that those comments had been taken on board by officers. He concluded by saying that the Community Council strongly contended that it had diligently fulfilled its obligations as a statutory consultee with regard



to this application. He confirmed, in response to a question from the Chair, that the Community Council was content with its initial decision to support the application.

The third speaker was Dr Mary O'Regan, speaking in support of the application. She advised that she lived in the hamlet that included the proposed development and was speaking on behalf of 5 of the 6 properties located on its side of the road. Those residents supported the application, believing that the development would significantly improve the hamlet, and appreciated the difficulties experienced by the applicant in maintaining an old property in such an exposed position. She noted that all the properties were a mixture of old and new, with additions to compensate for the effects of the weather. Given the age of the property, she therefore felt that it was impossible to weatherproof it and make it ecologically sound it without starting from scratch. Dr O'Regan noted that the applicant had been through the design process many times, and felt that the application under consideration was considerably designed for all neighbours. She acknowledged that any redevelopment would cause short term disturbance, given the proximity of the properties to each other, however the residents she was speaking on behalf of believed this to be worthwhile as they valued their neighbour and wanted her to have a long-term home that was comfortable, weatherproof and ecologically sound. They therefore supported the application.

The final speaker was Theresa Bowen, the applicant. She wished to thank her agent and advisors for their professionalism and integrity in the face of demanding critique and also to thank and commend officers of the Authority for their professionalism in reviewing the application and the objectors' concerns in a fair, unbiased and holistic manner. She explained that the application provided her with the opportunity to provide a home for her family, where they could spend time together, and to be free of the constraints of her existing living conditions. She noted that the desire to provide a comfortable home and protection for one's family was inherent in everyone - not a want, but a basic need. She had therefore done all she could to take account of the concerns raised and these had been at the forefront of design consideration. The design had been scrutinised by officers and had the support of relevant stakeholders, and she believed it would enhance the locality and cause no detriment to the amenity of those in the immediate vicinity. Ms Bowen advised that the application had the support of most neighbours, and she asked the Committee to approve it and allow her to create a new home and after 10 years of process, move on with her life.

One Member asked that condition 7 contained in the officer's report be amended to require the requirements for lighting be maintained in perpetuity.



Members said they were conscious of the professionalism of officers and the attention given to the application and believed the additional conditions to be helpful. They were also assured of the diligent and legitimate manner in which the Community Council had considered the application. The recommendation of approval was moved and seconded, subject to the conditions set out in the report, updating the references to the latest version of the plans, ensuring lighting was maintained as specified in perpetuity and inclusion of the additional conditions advised by the officer at the meeting.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with specified plans and documents, landscaping, retention of the boundary wall, surface water drainage, biodiversity enhancement scheme, external lighting, Construction Method Statement, ground levels, hours of demolition/construction, tree protection, a first floor bathroom window to be obscure glazed and top hung, use of the garage and use of the first floor roof.**

[Councillor A Wilcox returned during consideration of the following application]

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/22/0240/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Harrod  
PROPOSAL: The proposed demolition of the modern farm buildings, and the construction of a replacement new build dwelling including, in part, the conversion of existing historic barns, landscaping, solar panel array, bat night roost and associated works  
LOCATION: Lower Ripperston Farm, St. Brides, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3AH

This application had been reported to the previous meeting of the Committee when it had been deferred to allow a Site Inspection to take place (Minute 3b) refers), as it was classed as major development.

It was reported that the site comprised two semi-detached farm dwellings together with various agricultural buildings both modern and historic, set within this existing farmstead. The current proposal was to create a single residential unit from the existing farmhouse and adjoining cottage and to utilise some of the existing buildings across the site, linked at subterranean level and with two additional buildings that would appear as single-storey stone structures at ground floor level, to create a large second dwelling.



The current proposal sought to remove several large old farm structures from the site which were visible from a distance and replace them with sensitive traditional form and design structures which included subterranean levels that would be well screened. Officers considered that this would reduce the visual impact that this site had on the surrounding landscape including the coastal path, improving the views out over the bay and also from the bay back to the land. The application also included additional landscaping throughout the site and retained the existing ponds, and woodland to the west of the site.

It was noted that the existing site comprised two residential dwellings currently located within the semi-detached farmhouses to the eastern end of the site. The current proposal sought to retain two units within the site with no net gain of residential units. The existing farmhouse would be converted from two dwellings into one larger dwelling and the remaining residential unit would be relocated within the site into the existing stone barns with some additional structures added to increase the size.

Marloes & St Brides Community Council had objected on two grounds - loss of affordable homes and associated agricultural traffic generation. Officers considered that while the scale of the two residential dwellings was proposed to increase in this instance, there was currently no objection raised in respect of this aspect, given the overall reduction in visual impact associated with the wider development. In terms of additional agricultural traffic, the Highway Authority had raised no objections to this proposal considering that the proposed development had no detrimental impact to the existing parking arrangements, access or local highway network. Other matters, including the potential for land contamination, would be dealt with by conditions.

At the meeting the officer noted that no formal recommendation had been given in his report and further information had been awaited in respect of biodiversity. Detailed assessment of ecological considerations had been required under Section 63 of the Habitats Regulations, and a draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) report had been produced since writing the committee report, however this needed to be signed off by Natural Resources Wales (NRW). The recommendation was therefore one of delegated approval, subject to completion of the HRA by NRW, conditions set out in the report, together with an additional condition requested by the Ecologist. If the HRA was not completed within 3 months, delegated authority to refuse the application was sought, due to the lack of mitigation for the biodiversity impact of the proposed development.

Members asked a number of questions, and the officer confirmed that there were no public rights of way crossing the site, although there were a



number of private lanes, and that the 'market garden' referred to was simply a vegetable garden with no commercial aspect. Also there were no changes to the ridge height of the existing farmhouse. With regard to external lighting, it was requested that given the prominence of the site, this was conditioned separately in any permission and retained in perpetuity. They also recalled the interesting features of the historic buildings and supported the condition requiring them to be recorded photographically, but sought reassurance regarding their future use; the officer advised that there would be only a few new openings and no other significant alterations that raised concern.

The first of two speakers was Peter Smithies on behalf of Marloes and St Brides Community Council which had objected to the application. He advised that they had no objection to the barn conversion for residential use, as such. Permanent use was the best use of the resource. However it was noted that Pembrokeshire County Council had recently identified a need for 5-10 affordable houses in the community and at present the two modest semi-detached properties were within budget for many local residents on an open rental basis. Under the proposal to combine the two units into one they would no longer be suitable for a typical family and this would be a major loss to the community, and therefore they rejected the overall scheme. He stated that the officer's view that such concerns were offset by the overall reduction in the visual impact of the site was of little comfort to those who wanted to live and work locally. The Community Council believed that policy should be used as guidance only; the semi-detached dwellings should remain alongside the barn conversion, and that the application be approved on the basis of architectural merit and reduction of visual intrusion. The Community Council's other concern was the increase in farm traffic on the narrow roads when any work was undertaken on the land, as vehicles would have to come from outside the farm. Mr Smithies said that their request for an impact assessment or study to improve the interconnectivity of the wider farm holding using farm tracks had been dismissed by the agent. They hoped that as they had had the opportunity to voice their concerns in this respect, further consideration could be given to a solution. The Community Council acknowledged the investment required for the development and that this would benefit the Community, but their concerns regarding delivery of the development remained.

The second speaker was the agent, Geraint John, who noted that the scheme had been the subject of a site visit; he hoped that this had been beneficial and that Members had been able to appreciate the site and its setting. In addressing the biodiversity update, he noted the recommendation of delegated approval, subject to conditions, and to NRW's sign off of the HRA. The application had been found to be compatible with the Local Development Plan, and there would be no net



gain in the number of dwellings. He emphasised that the majority of the scheme involved the change of use, conversion and sympathetic renovation of existing barns and this was supported by officers. Using the natural topography of the site, the new build element would effectively be subterranean and wouldn't be visible from the approach road or the coastline. The proposals would 'unmask' the existing barns and the new stone barns would be in keeping with and improve the appearance of the site in the countryside. There would be a 65% reduction in the scale and mass of the site and there would be less visual impact than currently. There were no neighbour objections. With regard to the concerns of the Community Council, Mr John confirmed that there would be no loss of an affordable or tied dwelling, but there would be a like for like open market replacement. The new dwelling would be inhabited by the applicant and his family and it would provide them with a home. Turning to their concern regarding an increase in traffic, he noted that the farm had ceased to be operational, and therefore there was no operational traffic to be displaced. He added that the Highway Authority supported the scheme subject to conditions. He noted that the scheme was acceptable in other respects, subject to conditions, and was compliant with policy. He therefore hoped Members would accept the recommendation of approval.

Mr John confirmed to Members that the new build/conversion element would be one single dwelling, with a condition to prevent subdivision and subletting. He also confirmed that there were no public rights of way/footpaths, however there were access tracks to the wider holding which meant that agricultural trips could take place without the need to create additional tracks or generating traffic on the roads.

The officer confirmed that there would be no net gain in the number of dwellings, and therefore no need for a contribution to affordable housing.

Members believed the scheme was a good example of development that was sympathetic to the environment, and welcomed the 'peeling off' of modern buildings to reveal the farm buildings as they had been historically. Should permission be granted, they hoped to be able to visit the scheme once complete. The recommendation to delegate approval of the application subject to conditions, including the additional lighting and biodiversity conditions, and approval of the HRA, was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to completion of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) by NRW, conditions in respect of the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, use as a single unit of accommodation, C3 use only, land contamination**



**and remediation scheme, landscaping details and landscape management plan, arboriculture, photographic survey of existing buildings, lighting, removal of permitted development rights, undergrounding of cables and ecology. If the HRA was not completed within 3 months, delegated authority was given to refuse the application due to the lack of mitigation for the biodiversity impact of the proposed development.**

[The meeting was adjourned between 12.15pm and 12.25pm for a comfort break. Due to technical difficulties, the meeting was further adjourned for lunch and restarted at 1.10pm. Councillor S Hancock tendered his apologies and left the meeting.]

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/21/0085/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Huw Pendleton, Celtic Holiday Parks  
PROPOSAL: Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement  
LOCATION: Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepside, Narberth, Pembrokeshire, SA67 8NS

Members were reminded that this application had previously been considered at the Planning Committee on the 8<sup>th</sup> September 2021 when it had been deferred for a site visit, which took place on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2021. Legal advice had since been sought on the potential for attaching a legal agreement to relocate 9 caravans, approved by a previous permission, to the site that was the subject of this current application; legal advice confirmed that this was possible.

It was reported that Meadow House was a large caravan park accommodating just under 200 static caravan pitches. Forty-seven of these were permitted under a change from 55 touring pitches at the northern end of the holiday park (reference: NP/10/0450). Only 37 of the pitches had been implemented, with the intention of improving the internal layout of the caravan park and allowing a greater degree of landscaping, and it was 9 of the remaining pitches which were now being proposed for relocation to an area of land where no permission to site caravans had previously been approved. The overall number of pitches within the site was not proposed to be increased.

The report set out material planning history in relation to an appeal in 2012, which had been dismissed, for the stationing of lodges on the site the subject of this application, and also noted the change in planning policy resulting from the adoption of LDP2 in September 2020 and publication of draft Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Plan. As a



result of the change in policy the proposals, on as an existing caravan park with no increase in units on land could, in principle, be acceptable, subject to the landscape and visual impact of development.

It was noted that there was a dwelling immediately adjacent to the south of the application site with several dwellings located to the west of the county road outside the holiday park boundary. The ground levels within the application site sloped downwards and the road itself was considerably lower than the land within the site, the boundary between the two being topped by hedgerow and mature trees providing additional height to their screening effect immediately adjacent to the site. This boundary treatment had been thinned recently as part of groundworks within the application site, which had also been largely cleared through the removal of conifer trees. Works to create hedge banks had also been undertaken, and the current application showed replacement landscaping treatment. It was considered that static caravan units placed within this land would be visually contained within the holiday park, particularly with the additional boundary treatments proposed which would provide additional screening along the boundary with the road and the property to the south.

It was reported that correspondence had been received which raised concerns on the impact on privacy from the proposed static caravans on existing residential properties, as well as the potential for noise and disturbance from occupiers of the site. Officers considered that the layout of the units, the layout of neighbouring properties, the distances and separation by a public highway would effectively mitigate privacy impacts to a large extent. Taken with improved landscaping along the western boundary, which could be secured by condition, this would further filter views between the site and neighbours.

Concerns regarding other impacts to amenity such as noise and disturbance were noted, and it was acknowledged that there would be an increase in activity in this area of the site which was not present previously. However, this would be in the context of the existing wider caravan park, and it was reasonable to assume that the site operator / manager would ensure that the noise and disturbance was not allowed to reach such levels that they would cause unacceptable disturbance to the occupiers of other caravans on the site, and this would likely act to protect the amenity of neighbours. Details of noise management at the site could be secured by a planning condition.

It was confirmed that the scheme would not result in an increase in the overall units at the site as the removal of other units in the northern area of the site could be secured by a Section 106 agreement. A draft S106 had been received and its terms were under negotiation, and subject to





its signing, delegated approval was requested for the application subject to conditions.

Members sought clarification regarding the future of the hedgerow and ground levels along the lane to the west of the site, and the officer explained that apart from the section to be set back to allow creation of the visibility splay, the remainder of the hedge would be retained by condition. Additional landscaping was proposed along the boundary, and the caravans would be set back within the site, distancing them from the properties to the west which were also set back from the road. A noise management condition was also proposed. Concern was also expressed regarding the site's contribution to biodiversity and the Solicitor advised that condition 14 should be changed so that the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan referred to all land within the caravan site which was in the applicant's ownership, rather than the application site to which it was proposed to relocate the caravans only. The Officer confirmed the applicant had indicated via its agent that it was happy with that amended condition and also that points raised by Natural Resources Wales in respect of bats and dormice could be addressed by conditions.

The first of three speakers was Mr Dorian Evans, who lived opposite to the proposed site, and had been living there for over 40 years, prior to development of the Caravan Park's clubhouse and bungalow. At that time, the field in question had been a paddock and there had been no intention to use it as part of the caravan site. Mr Evans drew Members' attention to the application that had been dismissed at appeal in 2012. He stated that he believed that nothing had changed since then, and that the Inspector's decision was still relevant. He stated that noise emanating from the site would be clearly heard by neighbouring properties and there would be an increase in light pollution and overlooking. His objections had been set out in a 10-page email submitted in March 2021, and he asked the Committee to look at that, and note the photographs which had been included which had been taken when there were no leaves on the trees. He was also pleased to note that a site inspection had taken place, and he hoped Members had seen the proximity of his property to the site, and the elevated position of the proposed caravans which would cause overlooking. He noted that until 2 years ago, the club house had been screened by trees, however since these had been removed, the lights from there were visible, and he noted that the caravans would be much closer and therefore cause greater light pollution. He also referenced the report from Neil Taylor Ecology which stated that the field had been elevated by infill, although he didn't believe any such work should have been undertaken, and he questioned why no sectional drawings showing the height of the field had been submitted. Finally, Mr Evans questioned why there was a need to relocate the caravans and why they could not be relocated to the field at the far end of



the Caravan Park instead. He was also concerned that the conditions, particularly those relating to the roadside landscaping, would not be adhered to, noting that the current hedge was unkempt and badly maintained. He also noted that new trees or hedges would take many years to establish and suggested that other parties had reported damage to wildlife. He asked that the application be refused.

Members clarified that they had not received Mr Evans 10-page email and it was confirmed it had been sent to officers only. Members questioned whether the contents of Mr Evans' email had been included in the report before them and the officer confirmed that the points made had been considered and were included in the summary of objections. Members also clarified that they had not visited the site since 2021. Mr Evans was asked about the damage to wildlife which he had referred to, and he stated that the trees had been cut down, and the birds had therefore gone from the trees.

The second speaker was Councillor Alec Cormack, speaking on behalf of the Community Council, and he confirmed that he supported the Community Council's objections. Councillor Cormack stated that for anyone living in his Amroth Ward, caravans were part of the landscape as there were many caravan sites which had been in existence for decades, and he doubted these would gain planning permission today. Residents accepted these as their neighbours and as an important part of the local economy. However local residents expected that current planning regulations would prevent these sites expanding and encroaching further. The relocation of caravans to land where none were currently sited, and which was closer to neighbouring properties would have a significant impact on those properties, the difference in height being key; this couldn't be appreciated from an aerial photograph.

Councillor Cormack referred to a clear statement in the 2011 Local Development Plan, when the previous application had been rejected, that the policy was to restrict further caravan development, and he believed that Members should ask for a similarly clear explanation of the current policy position. While he acknowledged that there would be many situations where moving caravans around within a site would be acceptable, he did not believe that this was the case in the application before the Committee, due to the impact on the amenity of neighbours as well as on the landscape on the boundary of the National Park. He questioned whether the Committee had viewed the site from a footpath at nearby Church View from where the proposed development would fill a gap so that the view would be of caravans filling a huge area. He hoped that Members would defer the application to allow those who had not done so to visit the site.



Officers clarified that draft Supplementary Planning Guidance had been produced since the Inspector's decision in 2012, which had been based on work undertaken by a landscape consultant showing where additional development could be located. This was a strong material consideration. The current policy position was more nuanced than that in the previous plan and Landscape Character Area 1 (where the site was located) was one where there was limited capacity for extending some caravan sites where the extension was less prominent.

The final speaker was the Agent, Geraint John, who noted that the report set out officers' detailed consideration of the application and their recommendation of approval. He summarised that the proposed development sought a change of use for the relocation of 9 caravans, together with other improvements and enhancements. He noted that the application had previously been reported to the committee in September 2021 when it had been deferred for a site visit. The delay in its reconsideration had been due a need to resolve the only issue at that time of whether there was need for a S106 Agreement to ensure non-implementation of the balance of the caravans to be located on the site. He noted that officers had assessed the application and found that in principle it was acceptable, subject to landscaping and with relocation of the 9 caravans controlled by a S106 Agreement; there would be no increase in development. He stated that as a result of the sloping topography and landscaping, the site would be suitable screened from neighbouring properties. The hedgerow would remain, and had been deliberately excluded from the red line to create a corridor of ecological enhancement between the proposed development and the roadside and would screen the most visible parts of the site, leading to betterment and enhancement. He pointed out that the current application was materially different to that dismissed at appeal, which was dismissed purely on policy grounds, the Inspector did not believe development would have any adverse effect on residential amenity. Mr John did not believe that the development would have a detrimental impact on the amenity and privacy of nearby properties as the Caravan Park was well run and managed and promoted a 'relax and explore' philosophy. The Highway Authority had not objected, subject to an improved visibility splay at the road junction which would be enhancement, and the Tree and Landscape Officer was happy, subject to conditions. He noted that the only trees that had been removed were those to the rear of the site, adjacent to the clubhouse; these were visually dominant mature *Leylandii* which provided little biodiversity value. The site had been used as a back of house compound in recent years, for storage of surplus units and other paraphernalia, and had not been a green field as suggested. He concluded by saying that the site had no technical constraints or objections, except those from neighbouring properties and the Community Council, however officers had assessed these as part of their



report. The proposals were considered to be compliant with policy and had regard to the special qualities of the National Park. It also meant that there would be a reduction in the density of caravans on the northern part of the site which was more peripheral and had a greater visual impact and also that the improved landscaping would cover the whole of the site, as suggested by officers as a condition. He therefore asked Members to support the application.

One Member asked Mr John why the caravans were being relocated from the northern part of the site, and he replied that a lower density went hand in hand with the offer of higher quality that the applicant aspired to – internal landscaping and more space were valued. He also clarified that the storage area would be sited more centrally, opposite the clubhouse, going forward. Another Member said that she remained concerned about the biodiversity of the site, however Mr John explained that there had been additional landscaping to the northern part of the site where the units were now at a lower density, while the hedgerow had been excluded from the application site and would be buffered by landscaping. In addition, the applicant was prepared for the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to apply to the whole site.

In response to another question, the Director clarified that under a 2010 application, the site was subject to the standard 4-week holiday occupancy condition and could therefore operate all year.

One Member noted that there had been a number of new Members on the Committee since the application had been considered previously, and proposed that a site visit be undertaken. This was seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred in order for a Member Site Visit to take place.**

[Dr R Heath-Davies and Councillor R Owens tendered their apologies and left the meeting.]

[The officer began his presentation on the following application, but was interrupted by a technical issue. He continued once this had been resolved.]



- (d) REFERENCE: NP/22/0569/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr M Evans, Harbwr Brewery  
PROPOSAL: Change of use (retrospective) to allow building to be used Under Class A3 for retail, sales and public seating for use relating to Harbwr Brewery  
LOCATION: Bath Store, Sergeants Lane, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7BQ

It was reported that this application was being brought to the Development Management Committee as the applicant had been a Member who had left the Authority less than twelve months prior to the submission of this application.

The application site comprised an existing stone building which formed part of a range of historic commercial properties located along the narrow, pedestrian only, Sergeants Lane. These buildings had a long-standing connection with the nearby harbour. Immediately opposite the Bath Store building was the existing Harbwr Brewery which was also in the ownership of the applicant. The application was a retrospective application to allow the building to be used under Use Class A3 for retail, sales and public seating relating to the adjacent Harbwr Brewery.

Planning permission had been granted for this building in 2020 for a gin distillery (Use Class B2), public viewing area and retail sales area on the ground floor and an office / meeting room on the first floor. The planning statement submitted as part of the application stated that the gin distillery had never been implemented and the popularity of the brewery had increased demand for retail and seating associated with it.

The site lay within the Centre Boundary, Conservation Area and Retail Centre of Tenby Service and Tourism Centre as defined by Local Development Plan 2. It was reported that the previously approved scheme lifted the roof adding a slate finish and roof lights. Only a very minor external amendment to the development was proposed as part of this scheme, relating to a doorway. The Authority's Building Conservation Officer had no adverse comments on the scheme and in principle support had been received from Tenby Civic Society. With regard to the impact on Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, the works approved under the previous permission and implemented were considered to preserve the setting of the buildings.

In response to consultation, concerns had been expressed that the proposal would create noise nuisance to the residential properties adjoining Bridge Street/Crackwell Street as well as regarding the intensification of A3 use in an historic residential area and the capacity of the site to accommodate the proposal. Officers considered that as the



site was within the Retail Centre of Tenby Service and Tourism Centre, the principle of an A3 use was considered acceptable in this location. However a condition controlling hours of use, delivery and collection could be imposed to ensure that any potential impacts on the amenity of residential properties was limited.

At the meeting, the officer referred to a recent objection received in relation to the adjacent Stables Building (Minutes 6 (e) and (f) refer) which were in the same ownership. Contact had been made with the Public Protection Department of Pembrokeshire County Council (PCC) which had confirmed that there had been no noise complaints previously regarding this area of Sergeant's Lane, and as this was only an initial complaint, the source or level of impact were not clear. They had added that the Public Protection Team would not view entertainment noise as a reason to object to a planning application as it could be mitigated through other legislation and would view the proposed development as acceptable given the nature and character of the area within the town centre.

The officer also added that although the Lane was covered by Café Culture consent, a small triangular section in front of the building was not part of the highway, and therefore change of use was sought for that area.

One Member expressed her disappointment that someone who had served on the Authority's Development Management Committee had commenced work on a listed building without seeking planning guidance or permission, and noted that this statement applied also to the following two applications. The officer clarified that the Bath Store building was not a listed structure.

The first of two speakers, Mr Ted Lewis, then addressed the Committee. He explained that he lived in nearby St Julians Street and looked directly into the lane and could see the business being conducted, His remarks concerned the retrospective change of use in respect of both this, and the following application, and he intended to address the Committee only once, but asked that his comments be considered for both sites.

Mr Lewis noted that consent for the Bath Stores had been granted in February 2020, subject to conditions, with condition 3 stating that it was not to be used for anything other than a distillery with associated office public viewing and sales area, however he said that it had been used as an extension to the applicant's public house since day 1. He noted that when the original approval had been granted, the Lane had been described as somewhere for artisanal businesses to develop and as a trading quarter and questioned what had changed to justify its use as B3 – as a pub. He considered that had an application been made in 2020 for



a pub it would have been unlikely to succeed and was unaware of the justification since then that such a use was desirable.

Turning to the request for change of use at the Stables, Mr Lewis had looked at policies in respect of small-scale employment which, as suggested in TAN 24, were intended to promote a strong and resilient Wales. However he suggested that the change of use applications were likely to lead to low paid seasonal employment which did not satisfy the requirements of Future Wales – the National Plan 2040.

Mr Lewis went on to say that he had a personal concern regarding waste disposal from the businesses operated from Sergeants Lane. He explained that he owned a property on the corner of Sergeants Lane which had access doors to the cellar, and waste was put out twice a week on the junction of the Lane and St Julians Street, and in front of his cellar doors. He had previously expressed his concerns to the applicant and had been in correspondence regarding the matter over a number of years. He felt that it was inevitable that if the change of use was granted, that the waste disposal requirements would increase and cause greater difficulties. He was also concerned that as the applicant had failed to abide by the conditions imposed in 2020, that any restrictions imposed through conditions on the current application would be similarly ignored.

Mr Lewis referred to some publicity in the Tenby Observer newspaper which described Sergeants Lane as the drinking quarter of Tenby, and had been horrified to read it; he was concerned that if it became more of a drinking quarter, it would drive out local residents. It was currently a mixed-use area, however those people who lived there knew the atmosphere, noise and nuisance created by excessive drinking. He asked Members to refuse these retrospective applications.

On the subject of the rubbish, one Member suggested to Mr Lewis that the rubbish was placed in this location as a matter of practicality, due to the narrow nature of the Lane, however he said such discussions were between the proprietors and the Council, however he suggested that the applicant could place the rubbish in the beer garden of another of his premises further down the road. The Solicitor confirmed that waste disposal had the capacity to be a material consideration. Another Member sought clarification regarding whether there were other businesses that were not public house related, and Mr Lewis acknowledged that there were other businesses, however from the public point of view they were mostly drinking premises. In response to another question, the officer confirmed that no complaints had been received from other businesses on Sergeants Lane, regarding waste or the blocking of the highway.



The applicant, Mike Evans, then addressed the Committee. He thanked officers for a comprehensive report, and noted that the complaint had appeared since the agenda had been published, however there had been no complaints in respect of any of his businesses in 25 years.

Responding first to some of the comments that had been made, he noted that the application was for change of use and permission had been obtained for the work undertaken to the buildings. He also pointed out that the permission was in association with the brewery, which had a more relaxed atmosphere and focused on quality, the public house being a separate entity. He also noted that in respect of wages, the staff were paid exceptionally well and there was therefore no problem with staff retention. With regard to waste disposal, Mr Evans noted that 5 businesses left their recycling at the top of the lane, as that was where they had been instructed by PCC to do so.

Mr Evans stated that despite all the plans over the years, only ten years ago the lane was unused. The previous builders and plumbers had left, and the buildings were dilapidated and used by pigeons and rats. Today the situation had changed completely and any search of Instagram or Facebook would show that the local community and visitors were happy with what had been achieved. He stated that the lane had five thriving businesses – textiles, paintings, bespoke furniture as well as the brewery – and there had been many compliments regarding the improvements to the lane, and confidence was spreading to nearby businesses. He noted that Planning Policy Wales stated that leisure, food and drink benefitted retail and commercial centres. Turning specifically to the Bath Stores – named by the local plumbers – which lay within the retail centre of Tenby, he noted that the development at this location complied with the Local Development Plan which set the priorities for the town. The development was providing well paid jobs for local people and the company took pride in what it did and was mindful of the beautiful town where it was located. The buildings had been more than preserved, as the business had employed the best local craftsmen to preserve and safeguard every feature of importance, with sustainability at the core of everything that had been done. Both the staff and business tried to do nothing which would harm the area or community and even cleaned and maintained the whole lane at its own expense and provided bins. Accessible toilets had been installed on the ground floor of the original building and any steps had been built out to allow access. He stated that the Distillery would happen later, but at present the application sought to regularise the existing situation.

One Member asked about bottlenecks in the Lane, and Mr Evans stated that the businesses worked with PCC's Streetcare to try to keep the lane accessible. He said that waste was stored at the widest part, on a Sunday, as recycling was collected only once a week, and the majority of





the waste was placed in wheeled bins. He commented that they recycled heavily. He had spoken to the tenant of the affected business and had tried to mitigate its effects.

While acknowledging that it was regrettable that the application was retrospective, Members proposed and seconded the officer recommendation of approval. However given that waste could be a material consideration, they asked whether the management of waste from the property could be conditioned; the Solicitor replied that it would be reasonable to require a Waste Management Plan by condition, albeit it was difficult to control land not in the ownership of the applicant. The officer explained that such a plan would be submitted to the Authority and this would be consulted upon and would be part of the formal discharge of conditions if it was acceptable. Members hoped that such a plan would be required within a reasonable timeframe, given that the application was retrospective

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to accordance with approved plans and documents, hours of operation, delivery and collections, biodiversity and waste management.**

[Councillors R Jordan and M Wiggins tendered their apologies and left the meeting]

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/22/0563/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr M Evans, Harbwr Brewery  
PROPOSAL: Retrospective change of use of southern building and stable yard. Alterations to roofs, including insertion of roof-lights  
LOCATION: Stables Building and stable yard, Sergeants Lane, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7BQ

It was reported that this application was being brought to the Development Management Committee as the applicant had been a Member who had left the Authority less than twelve months prior to the submission of this application.

The stables were listed Grade II as part of a group of vernacular former service buildings within the Centre Boundary, Conservation Area and Retail Centre of Tenby Service and Tourism Centre as defined by Local Development Plan 2. Planning approval was sought for a retrospective change of use of the southern building and stable yard to A3 use, with the stable yard being used as a seating area for the existing, adjoining Harbwr Brewery. Alterations were also proposed to roofs, including



insertion of roof-lights and other associated works. A listed building application was also included on the agenda (minute 6(f) refers).

Officers considered that the principle of the development complied with policies of the Local Development Plan 2, and preserved the setting of the Listed Buildings with no real impact on their historic fabric or on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. There was unlikely to be any significant impact on nearby Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

It was reported that correspondence had been received which raised concerns that the scale of the overall A3 seating within this area was excessive and impacted on the character and appearance of the area, over development and intensification of public house activities. However officers considered that the current siting, scale, form, design and materials proposed were acceptable, and as the area was designated as part of the retail centre of Tenby, did not result in a significant level of A3 use at this location when considered in combination with the other A3 uses.

In terms of Amenity, correspondence had been received which raised concerns about noise impacting on nearby residential dwellings, light pollution, impact on amenity and the generation of excessive waste. PCC Public Protection section had been further consulted and did not raise any objections to the current proposal in terms of public protection, with no reported noise complaints having been identified from the existing A3 uses in Sergeants Lane to date. While it was recognised that there were several residential dwellings within close proximity to the host site and that there may be some impact on their amenity from the surrounding commercial businesses, it was not considered that the proposed development, on its own or in combination with other businesses, would result in any direct significant impact on these properties. However in order to control these impacts, conditions would need to be imposed in respect of opening and delivery times.

Members were reminded that Ted Lewis had indicated that his comments on the previous application also applied to this one and that he would not repeat them.

The applicant, Mike Evans, then addressed the Committee. He explained that the roof of the building was unique, but rotten, and that therefore in order to preserve it, another roof would be built on top. Roof lights would be installed to make use the natural light and save electricity and doors and windows would be of conservation style. No building works had taken place to date, with the retrospective aspect relating to the use of the building only; this was due to confusion over whether the outside seating area formed part of Café Culture consent. He noted that he owned



several other properties in close proximity and had never received complaints about noise; the impact on neighbouring properties had been taken into consideration. The application was submitted as a result of the growth of the brewery and sales of its products as well as other merchandise. He explained that they worked with many artisan producers and sold only small Welsh batch products.

Mr Evans said that the area was in the middle of Tenby's retail area, and its re-development had been included in every plan produced by Pembrokeshire County Council, its predecessor South Pembrokeshire District Council and the National Park Authority over the previous 40 years. However in that time, nothing had been spent on the buildings. Having worked with officers on the proposals that had already been implemented, the area was thriving, and there was a positive need for an extension. The core ethos of the business was sustainability and it worked with the community to safeguard what was existing and employed local staff, however there was a constant need for the business to adapt and to remain agile. He asked the Committee to support its vision.

One Member asked whether there would be any overlooking from the rooflights, but were advised that the elevation was such that they would look towards the sky. It was also confirmed that there were currently no rooflights in place, and that light pollution was not a concern due to the urban setting of the building. Some concern was expressed regarding noise as the site was surrounded by residential buildings. The officer advised that the area comprised a mix of commercial and residential properties and hours of use would be conditioned.

With regard to the concerns expressed by the objector about waste management, it was suggested that a condition could be imposed as had been on the previous application, and the officer recommendation of approval was moved and seconded with this addition.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the application, accordance with plans and documents, ecological enhancements, hours of opening and for deliveries, scheme of materials, asbestos and waste management.**

[Councillor D Clements tendered her apologies and left the meeting at this juncture.]



- (f) REFERENCE: NP/22/0564/LBA  
APPLICANT: Mr M Evans, Harbwr Brewery  
PROPOSAL: Alterations of roofs and wall-plates and reinstatement of slated finish. Insertion of roof-lights. Alterations and restoration of glazing and doors  
LOCATION: Stables Building and stable yard, Sergeants Lane, Tenby, SA70 7BQ

It was reported that this application was also before the Committee as the applicant had been a Member of the Authority within twelve months of the submission of the application. It fell within the provisions of the Listed Building Delegation Direction awarded to the Authority by the Welsh Government on 25th July 2012. A consideration of works requiring planning permission were contained within the accompanying planning application (NP/22/0563) (Minute 6(e) refers).

The stables were listed Grade II as part of a group of vernacular former service buildings along Sergeants Lane, a narrow lane of medieval origin that linked St Julians Street with Bridge Street, within Tenby Conservation Area. The stables were a later C19 rebuilding, probably incorporating earlier fabric, and were currently in poor repair. The proposed scheme was considered to be in keeping with the character of the listed building, and its setting in terms of design and form. As such, the application could be supported subject to conditions.

Members asked whether the existing fabric would be sufficiently protected during construction, and were advised that the features on the ground floor were away from the main works to the roof and would in any case be covered by other legislation.

The applicant, Mike Evans, briefly addressed the Committee to draw attention to the work of officers and thank them for working with him to achieve a sympathetic development which benefitted the town. He believed that the built environment in Tenby was amazing, and it was important that it was protected for the benefit of future generations.

Members welcomed the careful re-use of heritage buildings which ensured their economic prosperity, commending the applicant for trying to keep the character of the area. The recommendation was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That listed building consent be granted, subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, structural report, samples of materials, asbestos, protection of listed features, photographic survey and ecology.**



- (g) REFERENCE: NP/22/0513/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs M & C Harris, Newgale Campsite  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing toilets/shower/store/laundry & removal of touring caravans for reception to an alternative site outside the flood zone with expansion, replacement toilets/showers/store/ laundry room, reception/office & meeting room, creation of 12 grass tent plateaus (retrospect), erection of security cctv flagpole, conversion of relinquished public toilet block to takeaway cafe/ice cream parlour with small extension to create a replacement public toilet & associated works  
LOCATION: Newgale Camping Site, Newgale, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6AS

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn.

**NOTED.**

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/22/0151/FUL  
APPLICANT: Dr & Ms A & S Richards  
PROPOSAL: Single storey extension to rear and alterations to south gable end  
LOCATION: Castle View, 21, Warlows Meadow, Manorbier, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7TG

It was reported that this property lay within the centre boundary of Manorbier and the application for extension & alterations was sited within the existing domestic curtilage of the dwellinghouse. The extension proposed was for a single storey and would add a minor increase to the overall floorspace of the property.

The proposed extension & alterations were considered to be of a suitable design, scale and siting which would not have an adverse impact upon the character of the host property nor on the wider landscape and special qualities of the National Park. The development was of a scale and form that was considered a suitable addition to a domestic dwellinghouse and would be discretely sited to the side/rear of the property. It was noted that the scale and form of the currently proposed development was much reduced than previously refused applications on this site.

Objections had been made on this scheme regarding the adverse impact which the proposed development would have on the amenity and privacy



of neighbouring properties. However the officer considered that subject to the implementation, and completion, of suitable boundary treatments prior to the commencement of any works on site, the use of a condition removing permitted developments for this site, and the mindful control of adverse light spillage into the surrounding landscape and into neighbouring properties, the scheme in this instance, was not considered to cause an unacceptable level of detrimental impact on the privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties. The degree of adverse encroachment caused by required boundary treatments was considered to be sufficiently mitigated by corresponding planning gain, as secured and regulated by appropriate condition.

At the meeting, the DM Team Leader, who was presenting the application in the absence of the planning officer, noted that since the report had been written, both the Highway Authority and Cadw had advised that they had no objection to the scheme. The officer also advised that she felt the proposed condition for a 1.8m high fence along the length of the dwelling was too onerous and retention of the fence as existing should be sufficient, given the existing level of overlooking at the site; she also suggested that the window to be obscure glazed could be permitted to open, as long as it was top hung, and in these regards sought to amend the conditions proposed. These amended conditions were displayed for Members' consideration.

The Chair noted that the application had come before the Committee at the request of Members. They noted that they had found the photographs showing the different levels on site to be helpful, and had wanted to allow Manorbier Community Council the opportunity to speak on the application, however they had not wished to do so. Members were happy with the revised conditions and the officer recommendation of approval was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, external finishes, window to be obscure glazed and top hung, retention of existing fence, removal of Permitted Development rights, outbuildings to be used only for domestic purposes ancillary to the dwellinghouse, ecology and biodiversity enhancement scheme, lighting and surface water drainage.**



- (i) REFERENCE: NP/22/0217/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms L F Flux  
PROPOSAL: Proposed holiday let/ Air B&B accommodation  
LOCATION: 6 Clement Terrace, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70  
7LA

It was reported that the site lay on a small triangular parcel of land to the north of the end of the terraced dwelling at 6 Clement Terrace and was outside of the Tenby Conservation Area. The Conservation Area adjoined the rear of the garden along Greenhill Avenue but there was no intervisibility between it and the development site.

The proposed development comprised a part-retrospective shepherds hut style caravan constructed of timber with timber cladding. The structure had previously been used as overflow accommodation to the main dwelling house and was located within the front/side curtilage of the property.

The proposed use, which had not yet commenced, would be self-catering accommodation which required change of use consent. The outbuilding also required consent due to its position forward of the building line of the property.

Objections has been received from Tenby Town Council stating that the proposed change of use from a use ancillary to the enjoyment of the main dwelling house to self-catering accommodation would result in the over development of the site and also concerns regarding the highway access. Officers considered that the existing shepherds hut was an appropriate structure to offer the proposed self-catering accommodation within the centre of Tenby. The hut was not suitable for market or affordable housing due to the small scale of the structure and limited amenity space and therefore was considered appropriate for holiday use only. The Highway Authority had offered no objection to the application, and its location opposite the train station and with car parking nearby meant that the application could be supported.

The proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the property and would not cause an unacceptably detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park. Due to the non-residential nature of the existing use to the north, the use of the shepherds hut was considered to have an acceptable impact on the adjacent amenity. As such, the development complied with policies of the LDP 2 and could be supported.

The agent, Ceri Davies, then addressed the Committee, explaining that



the hut had been erected as the applicants did not believe it needed planning permission. He explained that the space was vacant and redundant, and it was considered to provide a positive contribution towards tourism and assist in the decline in holiday accommodation in what was an established service centre in a seaside location, and also take the pressure off housing which was often used as holiday accommodation. He confirmed that the main dwelling would remain as residential, with the hut being subordinate. Mr Davies noted that although the design of the structure was not traditional, the site was well contained and it became visible only when on site, so it was concealed and inconspicuous. Turning to the objections by Tenby Town Council, he believed that the hut sat comfortably in a confined space and although it was located in proximity to the neighbouring boundary, this was non-residential and there would be no loss of residential amenity. The nearest dwelling was at 5 Clement Terrace, from which no objection had been received. With regard to highway access, the development was situated in a central and sustainable location, off a private road, close to 3 car parks, as noted by the Highways Officer. He concluded by saying that the proposal would provide a high standard of accommodation in a sustainable location and adhered to the tourism strategy which sought a variety of accommodation and enhancement of the town as a year-round destination.

One Member expressed concern that by approving the application, other applications for similar development could be submitted. The officer acknowledged that this was a risk, however the main consideration in this instance was the lack of impact on residential amenity as there were no neighbours other than the host dwelling house.

In response to Members questions, it was agreed that 'in perpetuity' could be added to condition 3 (external lighting) and that an explanation be provided for Use Class C6.

**DECISION: that the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, external lighting, biodiversity enhancement, used for Use Class C6 (short term holiday let) only.**

## 7. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 2 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.

The Team Leader also reminded Members that a copy had been circulated of the Inspector's Decision in respect of the refusal of a





Development of National Significance application (DNS/3261355) by Rhoscrowther Wind Farm Limited for the construction and operation of three wind turbines, together with ancillary development comprising substation compound, electricity transformers, control building, new site entrances, access tracks, crane hardstanding, temporary construction compound and associated works on land off Refinery Road, Hundleton, Pembrokeshire, SA71 5SJ.

She considered this to be a good outcome, with the impact on the National Park taken seriously by the Inspector. She commended the officer for giving evidence on behalf of the Authority, and this was echoed by Members. It was noted that such applications took a tremendous amount of time and impacted on workload.

A Member asked about the ongoing appeal at Trewern, Nevern, and was informed that the Planning Inspector had allowed an extension of time for negotiation to take place, and that was still ongoing.

**NOTED.**

<p>The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 8 March 2023 without amendment</p>
---

