

Development Management Committee

7 December 2022

Present (In Person)

Dr M Havard (Chair)

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

Present (Remotely)

Councillor Mrs D Clements, Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs J James, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor C Williams.

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock and Virtually 10.00am – 11.55am;
12.05pm - 1.00pm; 1.20pm – 3.10pm]

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:

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
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(d) below NP/22/0388/FUL Kenmore, Pen y Craig, The Glen, Saundersfoot	Councillor C Williams	Remained in the meeting

3. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 19 October 2022 and the 16 November 2022 were presented for confirmation and signature.

With regard to the meeting held on 19 October 2022, it was recorded in the Decision regarding NP/22/0388/FUL (Minute 6(d) refers) that the Highway Authority be requested to attend the site inspection. It was clarified that officers were trying to arrange a workshop with the Highway



Authority with regards to planning matters more generally, rather than on this application in particular.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2022 be confirmed and signed subject to the above amendment and that the minutes of the meeting held on the 16 November 2022 be confirmed and signed as presented.

4. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7th December 2011, 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/22/0148/FUL Minute 6(a) refers	Demolition of existing bungalow and construct new dwelling – Braeside, Freshwater East	Vicky Tomlinson (objector) – in person Mr R Talliss (Community Council) – in person
NP/22/0176/FUL Minute 6(b) refers	Application for 3 x polytunnels, new access point, track and hard standing, ponds and dwelling under the One Planet Development policy - Land to the North of Castell Cadw known as Parc Calch, Felindre, Crymych,	Kate McEvoy (supporter) – in person Richard Sylvester (applicant) – in person
NP/22/0338/FUL Minute 6(d) refers	Replacement Dwelling - Kenmore, Pen y Craig, The Glen, Saundersfoot	Mr Peter Chesmore (objector) – in person Mr Darren Thompstone



		(applicant) – in person
NP/22/0464/FUL Minute 6(g) refers	Creation of bespoke off-street parking and turning area with landscaping mitigation - 131, Castle Way, Dale	Kevin Rogers (applicant) – in person
NP/22/0482/FUL and NP/22/0483/FUL Minute 6(h) and 6(i) refers	Remodelling of front facade and altering existing flat roof to form roof terrace – Goscar House and Sea House Crackwell Street, Tenby	Mr G Downes (objector) – virtually Chris Titterton (Applicant) & Tim Colquhoun (Agent) – in person

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*):



- (a) REFERENCE: NP/22/0148/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Allen
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing bungalow and construct new dwelling
LOCATION: Braeside, Freshwater East

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as Lamphey Community Council had objected to it, contrary to the views of officers. An objection had also been received from Freshwater East Community Association, as outlined in the report.

The proposal sought to demolish an existing 4 bedroomed detached single storey chalet style property and replace it with a contemporary 4 bedroomed property located close to the existing footprint. The new property would be 1.5 storey high and when viewed in its wider context would match that of existing properties in the immediate area, many of which were full 2 storey and located on land higher than the subject property. The site was screened from view of its neighbours by mature woodland.

The application was for a replacement dwelling, and therefore the principle of residential accommodation had been established. While some of the new building would be outside of the existing footprint, this would allow the new building to make use of the site's topography, reducing its height and setting the building into the landscape when viewed from the coast. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) had been submitted and a condition would require this to be formally discharged, ensuring the compliance in respect of construction methods, access mitigation and pollution controls to protect the surrounding Local Nature Reserve.

The Building Conservation Officer had no objection to the demolition of the existing building and officers considered that the scale, design and layout of the proposed replacement were in accordance with the policies of the Local Development Plan 2. It was not considered to result in an impact upon the amenity and privacy of neighbouring properties, and the recommendation was one of approval, subject to conditions as set out in the report.

At the meeting, the officer confirmed that the size of the proposed dwelling was greater than that of the existing building, however this was considered to be appropriate due to the size of the plot. He also confirmed that Natural Resources Wales had advised they had no objection to the proposals in respect of either the capacity of the septic tank or the impact on biodiversity.



It was noted that although the building would also be higher than the existing, from the rear it would appear as single storey as it was cut into the bank. From the beach, officers did not believe the building would be very visible as it was set back from the edge of the slope; the balcony would also help to prevent any light spill. One Member asked that a specific lighting condition be included to mitigate the impact on bats.

The first of two speakers was Mr Talliss who was representing Lamphey Community Council. He advised that they supported the principle of redevelopment of the existing dwelling, but were not happy with the proposed development. He explained that the burrows area was a natural dune ecosystem which was steep in nature. It was characterised by single storey dwellings, many of which had been built prior to the establishment of Town and Country Planning Act and had only a modest impact on the established woodland when viewed from the beach. The area was subject to severe environmental pressures as a result of plot development during the interwar period and he said that upon its inception in 1952, the National Park limited development in this area. The existing dwelling was a modest 3 bed property that was 3.5m high, while the proposed was described as 1.5 storey (9m) and with 4 bedrooms, though Mr Tallis believed it was 2 storey and surmised that other rooms could also be used as bedrooms. The proposed dwelling was therefore 2.4 times (5.5m) higher – taller than the trees – and with twice the footprint and three times the floor area. The Community Council did not believe this was in keeping, considering that the single storey chalets were characteristic of this part of the National Park, not large modern houses. They therefore asked the Committee to refuse the application on the grounds of size, both height and volume, that it was out of keeping with the area, visually detrimental, especially when seen from afar and in the context of the woodland and would set a precedent for redevelopment of other chalets.

The second speaker was Vicky Tomlinson who was also objecting to the application. She explained that she lived in Freshwater East, although not overlooking this property, and was a member of the Community Association. She said that she didn't think the summary of objections was sufficient, omitting details of the loss of amenity, and that the report did not consider the view of the development from the woodland behind it. This woodland was owned by the National Park Authority and it was designated as Access Land as well as a Local Nature Reserve with a wonderful play area. She said that at the moment, the chalet wasn't really visible when people were enjoying the woodland, however the new property would rise significantly above the boundary and would urbanise the woodland area. Mrs Tomlinson went on to state that there was a dispute as to whether it was a 4 bed roomed property that was being replaced, was concerned over the scale of the proposed dwelling, and



believed that this had the potential to become a larger property. She noted that the original property had been used by an elderly couple, however once completed the new property had the potential to sleep 8 – 12 people and therefore potentially 4 cars. This increase in traffic would be detrimental to the unmade road which had a difficult visibility splay; this was without taking account of construction traffic, which could include the use of a large crane and excavation equipment. A plan was needed to mitigate damage to the road leading to the development, over which there was a right of way, and noted that the documentation submitted referenced only 1 of the 2 lanes which could be used for access.

Turning to policies, Mrs Tomlinson believed that the development would cause significant visual intrusion and intensification of use, contrary to policy 14. She also believed there would be an impact on amenity and privacy, particularly the leisure use of the woodland behind and suggested that a site visit might be helpful to allow Members to understand the impact. She also believed that the development would cause an adverse impact on biodiversity due to light pollution from the south elevation and pointed out that although the report advised there would be no problem with foul drainage as the number of bedrooms would remain the same, she noted that the number of WCs would increase from 2 to 5. She concluded by saying that while she acknowledged that a more modern building was needed, the proposals were out of keeping with the area.

The Chair noted that some Members had visited Freshwater East on a Study Day earlier in the year and although this particular application was not discussed or the site visited, this provided a helpful context for consideration of the application.

Members were concerned that the integral garage could be converted and they asked that the replacement building's permitted development (PD) rights be removed to prevent this. Officers advised that as the Highway Authority and NRW were content it would be difficult to justify that such a condition was both reasonable and necessary, however PD rights in respect of significant extensions were often removed on replacement dwellings, and a condition to this effect could be included. It was clarified that this would only control extensions and could not control internal changes to the proposal, such as repurposing garage areas as was suggested may be the case. Concerns were also expressed regarding the impact of construction traffic on the access track, and the officer confirmed that a CEMP had been submitted and the Authority's Estates Officer had been consulted. Members were also concerned about the trees on the site, however the officer reassured them that fencing was proposed to protect them during construction.



It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved, subject to conditions, including the additional conditions in respect of lighting and the removal of permitted development rights for extensions as discussed.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions regarding timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, parking and turning, arboriculture, ground levels, Construction Method Statement, biodiversity enhancement, lighting and removal of permitted development rights.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/22/0176/FUL
APPLICANT: Ms N Hope
PROPOSAL: Application for 3 x polytunnels, new access point, track and hard standing, ponds and dwelling under the One Planet Development policy
LOCATION: Land to the North of Castell Cadw known as Parc Calch, Felindre, Crymych, Pembrokeshire, SA41 3XA

It was reported that the proposal was for a One Planet Development (OPD) located within the wooded Afon Nyfer valley. The site was located less than a mile west of Felindre Farchog and one mile south of Nevern and it was surrounded on all sides by mature woodland and thick hedgerows.

The OPD included 3 x polytunnels, new access point, track and hard standing, ponds and dwelling. The development would focus around an organically managed small holding providing sustainable, healthy, local food whilst increasing biodiversity. The application sought planning permission under the OPD policy to develop agricultural infrastructure linked to the land-based business activities, and to build a small 'cabin' home as the sole residence of the applicants.

Officers considered that the proposed development, on balance, complied with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 6: Planning for Rural Communities (2010) and the accompanying One Planet Development Practice Guidance (2012) in that the proposal was supported by sufficient information to demonstrate that as an exception to development in the countryside there was a strong prospect that the proposal would meet the One Planet Development criteria within the required timescales. The submitted information indicated that the development would achieve the overall reduction in ecological footprint, as set out in One Planet policy and practice guidance documents.

Officers considered that the development would not cause an unacceptable or detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park and included various proposals to improve the site's environment



and biodiversity and to protect existing trees and plant new hedgebanks. The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of any nearby residents and would not result in any unacceptable impacts on highway safety. As such, the proposal complied with policies of the adopted Local Development Plan 2020 and the general policies of Future Wales and could be supported. The recommendation was therefore that the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions and to a Section 106 agreement which tied the dwelling and the management plan to the land, ensured that the dwelling would be the sole residence, that the OPD would be subject to ongoing monitoring and that in the event of failure the exit strategy would be implemented. Where, an agreement was not provided within three months of the resolution of Committee it was also requested that delegated powers to refuse the application be granted.

At the meeting, the Director, who presented the report, advised that the layout had been informed by discussions with officers, with structures located away from the road and additional planting to minimise visibility. However an updated site plan had been received which provided additional nesting sites for barn owls in response to concerns. She also confirmed that Natural Resources Wales (NRW) had no objection to the use of compost toilets as part of the development and that Welsh Government Highways had accepted the proposed new access subject to conditions, while the Tree and Landscapes Officer had no objection to the resultant loss of trees needed to create a safe access, subject to conditions.

In response to Members' questions, the officer confirmed that the application was not retrospective, and that the current 'veg box' business which operated from the site was classed as agriculture. The land was classed as Grade 4 and was therefore not high grade agricultural land. She noted that the Management Plan anticipated production of honey and eggs in addition to vegetables, and that the Authority's Technical Advisors were confident that the information provided in the plan was accurate and the forecasts in respect of food production were reasonable. It was noted that a workshop on One Planet Developments would take place in due course.

The first of two speakers on this application was Kate McEvoy. She was speaking as a local resident who ran a horticultural business growing seeds, as well as a local representative of Gweithwyr y Tir / Landworkers' Alliance Cymru and was in support of the development. Having seen that some objectors had questioned the capacity of the area to support another market garden, she advised that she had spoken to several local businesses who explained that greater supply would make their businesses more viable as they couldn't currently meet demand. She



noted that intensive horticulture was different to farming, and that her businesses, although not an OPD, grew products to a value of £100,000 per year from 2.5 acres direct sales through intensive vegetable production. She commended the applicants' commitment to sustainability and was pleased to see a young couple returning to Pembrokeshire to work the land in innovative ways, countering the problem of an aging agricultural workforce. The proposal also supported Welsh Government's target for a 29-fold increase in the amount of land to be used for horticulture in Wales. She stated that although there was little grade 1 land in Wales, it was still possible to run a profitable horticultural business.

One of the applicants, Richard Sylvester, then spoke. He explained that the application had been carefully designed over the previous three years to comply with Welsh Government policies including the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act and the TAN 6 guidance notes, in addition to local policies such as those in the Local Development Plan, National Park Management Plan and Nature Recovery Action Plan. He explained that they had a vision to create a viable and sustainable business which contributed to the local economy and created habitats to benefit wildlife. They had worked with officers at pre-application stage, as well as with various consultants and experts and had met with the Community Council and neighbours, many of whose comments had informed their plans.

He said that the business had grown over the previous two seasons and now had a loyal customer base, producing 1.3 tons of vegetables last year, with much positive feedback; there had been recognition and support from local and national organisations and the business had won a green Gold Award for its sustainability and carbon reduction plans. There had been greater demand for veg than could be met and as a result the growing space had been expanded accordingly.

The infrastructure on the site was only what was necessary to run a low impact market garden, with structures placed for sun, shelter and to minimise visual impact. An assessment of the latter had been undertaken and this had found a low impact, which would be reduced further as the trees matured and the hedges grew – one thousand trees of native coppice had been planted to date, and more, including fruit trees and a Pembrokeshire hedgebank were planned. This would improve biodiversity and create habitats for many species, including ten priority species. The new vehicle access had been designed in consultation with the Trunk Road Agency and had been assessed by an ecologist, however OPD required a reduction in their travel footprint and vehicle movements and this was set out in the Management Plan, as was the exit strategy should things not go to plan. There would be regular monitoring against the Management Plan as required. The applicants were committed to



OPD, having backgrounds in sustainable and environmental management, and also to providing nutritious vegetables to the community and habitats for wildlife. They valued the landscape of the area and were involved in a number of environmental community projects, with the intention to make an ever greater contribution.

In response to questions from Members, Mr Sylvester confirmed that although the site was 10 acres, 6.5 acres formed the application site, that it was intended to register the land as organic and that the concrete base for the dwelling consisted of individual concrete pads for each supporting pile, rather than a slab. He also clarified that although the cabin met the legal definition of a caravan, it would be a new build wooden dwelling, clad with larch and a reclaimed slate roof. One Member asked whether sufficient water could be collected as the current year had demonstrated that there could be extended periods without rain. The applicant explained that the soil was a clay sandy loam which held water well, and they operated a no dig system which used mulch to retain water and therefore the need for irrigation. He was confident that sufficient water would be available.

Some Members questioned whether there was a need for the applicants to live on site, and there were concerns regarding the number of OPD developments in the area, however officers explained that OPD applications were different to those for a second agricultural dwelling for example, being integral to minimising the applicants' ecological footprint. She added that if the business failed, the dwelling would have to be removed as part of the exit strategy. Other Members, however felt that the application appeared to meet the criteria for OPD and would increase biodiversity net gain, as well as increase production of artisan food. The officer recommendation to delegate approval subject to conditions and completion of a S106 Agreement was proposed and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to a Section 106 agreement which: tied the dwelling and the management plan to the land, ensured that the dwelling would be the sole residence, that the OPD would be subject to ongoing monitoring and that in the event of failure the exit strategy would be implemented. Where an agreement was not provided within three months of the resolution of Committee, delegated powers were given to refuse the application. The application was subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, occupancy, accordance with the Management Plan with annual report, details of temporary accommodation, lighting, removal of permitted development rights, tree protection, landscaping, access, parking and turning and drainage.



- (c) 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

It was reported that the application sought full planning permission for the demolition of the modern farm buildings, a replacement new build dwelling including, in part, the conversion of existing historic barns and associated external works. The site was located within the open countryside as defined within the LDP2. The application was a major development and was of public interest, as such, it was requested that Members consider a committee site visit to view the site and its surroundings prior to consideration of the planning application at a subsequent Committee meeting.

DECISION: That the Committee undertake a Site Inspection prior to consideration of the application at a future meeting.

[The Meeting was adjourned between 11.55am and 12.05pm]

[Councillor C Williams disclosed a personal, but not prejudicial interest in the following application and remained in the meeting while it was discussed.]

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/22/0388/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr D Thompstone
PROPOSAL: Replacement dwelling
LOCATION: Kenmore, Pen y Craig, The Glen, Saundersfoot

Members were reminded that this application was being brought back to the Development Management Committee following a Members' site visit on the 16 November 2022 (Minute 3 refers).

The site consisted of a single storey detached dwelling located within a fairly spacious plot, and planning permission was sought for the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement with a flat roofed, two storey property, increasing to three storey towards the east. There was an existing detached pool house, adjacent to an external swimming pool, which it was also proposed to replace.

The site was within the centre boundary of Saundersfoot and the replacement of an existing dwelling was considered acceptable. While



the scale of the proposed dwelling was notably larger than the existing dwelling, large detached dwellings were characteristic of the surrounding area and the proposed dwelling would not appear significantly higher. Also the proposed dwelling was situated within a fairly substantial plot served by a large area of amenity space and the proposal was therefore not considered overdevelopment of the site. It was also noted that the proposed contemporary design differed to the surrounding dwellings, however these varied in terms of their scale and designs and there was no consistent or uniform design in the area. The proposed dwelling was also set back from the front of the site and its siting, and established vegetation within the area, reduced its visibility. As a result, the proposed development was considered acceptable in terms of its scale, design, siting and materials and would not have a detrimental impact on the character or visual amenities of the surrounding area or on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The recommendation was one of approval, subject to conditions.

The officer noted that at the site inspection, Members had asked the distance of the proposed dwelling to the property to the south. She advised that at its closest the distance was 21m, however this was to the balcony, and it was 24m to the actual glazing. She advised that officers believed there was a perception of overlooking, and the recommendation was one of approval. However she added that if Members were concerned about the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling, it would be possible to ask for obscure glazing at first floor level on the southern elevation, however the balcony would remain.

The first of two speakers was Peter Chesmore who owned a nearby property. His main concern was overlooking from the proposed property into his children's bedroom, his bathroom and his garden where the children played, thereby impacting his privacy, and he asked that the veranda be removed to prevent this or the property be moved further away. He also feared that the veranda and flat roof area could be used for parties, creating noise, and he requested that a condition be imposed to prevent such a use. He also noted that the lane was too narrow for the likely increase in numbers of people living in the house as it was single track, and he feared there could be a collision point at the top of the road due to increased traffic. He also felt there would be a negative impact in taking down a lovely house and replacing it with what he called a 'concrete jungle hotel' which he felt was too large and could be seen from the sea front; he believed that other neighbours were not happy with the development either. He felt that any replacement dwelling should be more traditional and in keeping with other Pembrokeshire properties, whose designs did not usually include large verandas. He felt that allowing this proposal could encourage others to develop in a similar style.



The applicant, Darren Thompstone, then addressed the Committee. He noted that the existing property faced due south, with the bedrooms looking out over the objector's property, however the new dwelling would face east, out to sea. He pointed out that there was only a small balcony on the southern side, which was about 1m wide and would be used mainly for cleaning the windows. He said that obscured glazing could be put in the window on that elevation as it was a dressing room; the main windows and balcony were on the eastern elevation. He explained that the property had been turned to create an area for parking and turning as at present this was inadequate. The drainage would also be improved as currently this mixed surface and foul water. Mr Thompstone noted that the new property had enough solar panels to be off grid, and the connection was principally to allow energy to be exported to the grid. It would be environmentally friendly and material from the existing house, which was built mainly of rubble, would be recycled for use in the garden walls and landscaping. He went on to say that the existing property had 4-5 bedrooms, so the proposed dwelling would have no additional bedroom space and he pointed out that neighbouring properties were larger and one of these also had a flat roof. In respect of construction traffic, he said that as he lived on the lane at present, any traffic would go past his house, and he had had no objections from anyone else living on the lane. He concluded by saying that the proposed property would reduce the level of overlooking from that at present and the height had also been reduced.

Some Members remained concerned about the design of the property, which they felt was harsh and boxy and didn't fit well with Saundersfoot's gentle landscape. Although they acknowledged there were other flat roofed dwellings in the area, it was felt that they were more nestled or surrounded by trees and the proposal would stand out on the horizon because of the change of shape and increase in size. They also agreed that the properties were in a bowl and sound could travel and resonate around the valley and that there would be overlooking which would unduly affect the neighbour.

Other Members, however, noted that this was a built-up area and it was inevitable that you would hear your neighbours. It was also suggested that although the design was conceptual and looked harsh in the drawings, that it would be less so once built. The mix of styles in the area was also noted. The recommendation of approval subject to conditions as set out in the report was therefore moved and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions regarding the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, arboricultural details, parking and turning,



Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), surface water drainage, protection of public sewer, biodiversity enhancement scheme and external lighting.

- (e) 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

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 four other dwellings to the west. The application sought demolition of the existing property and its replacement with a larger 6-bedroom dwelling.

It was noted that this was the third application for this site in the last 4 years, however as a number of the new Members did not know the site at Ringstone, it was requested that Members consider a Committee Site Visit to view the site and its surroundings prior to consideration of the planning application at a subsequent Committee meeting.

It was reported that Mr Daniel Wood, an objector, and Mr Jonathan Pickford, the agent, had indicated that they wished to speak at the meeting that day, having also been advised that if they wished to speak when the application came before the Committee for decision they would have only 3 minutes at that time. They both advised that they would not speak on this occasion but would wait until the application came back before the Committee.

One Member also noted that they had received comprehensive correspondence from Mr Gardner which had been helpful and asked that their thanks be recorded.

DECISION: That the Committee undertake a Site Inspection prior to consideration of the application at a future meeting.

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/22/0462/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr G Meopham
PROPOSAL: Demolition and replacement of existing dwelling house
LOCATION: Tar House, Knapp Farm Lane, Llangwm, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 4HN

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as the



applicant was an employee of PCNPA and whilst there were extended delegation powers currently in place which meant that this could currently be determined by officers, these delegation powers would cease at the end of December 2022 and in the interests of transparency it was considered appropriate to bring this application to Committee.

The proposal briefly comprised an application to demolish an existing 3 bedroomed detached property and replace it with a smaller 3 bedroomed detached property. It was noted that although the floor levels would remain the same, the height of the roof would increase by 1m due to its pitch. The attached garage would be retained. As the existing dwelling was in lawful use, the principle of residential accommodation was accepted in this location.

Officers considered that the development was in accordance with policy, was appropriate and could be supported. The scheme incorporated a sustainable design that provided modern living accommodation. The development would be in keeping with the aims of the LDP2, in that the development would conserve and enhance the existing character of the site and the special qualities of this area of the National Park. As such, subject to a schedule of suitable conditions to control the development, it was considered to be acceptable and the recommendation was one of approval.

Members noted that replacement of the property in a similar form to the existing was a radical move, and assumed that the new design would be more energy efficient, although it was noted that there were many actions that could be taken to improve efficiency short of demolition and rebuilding. The officer advised that the reason for rebuilding was due to the poor quality of the existing building, with the replacement being more energy efficient with solar panels. Another Member asked if there were any photographs looking back at the dwelling from the beach and car park at Black Tar, however the officer advised that he did not have any longer-range photos and did not believe the replacement dwelling would have an impact that was any greater than the existing, the design being similar in scale. The recommendation was moved and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, construction method statement and tree protection.

[Councillors C Williams and S Hancock tendered their apologies and left the meeting.]

[The meeting was adjourned between 1pm and 1.20pm]



- (g) REFERENCE: NP/22/0464/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs K & T Rogers
PROPOSAL: Creation of bespoke off-street parking and turning area with landscaping mitigation
LOCATION: 131, Castle Way, Dale, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3RN

It was reported that this application was presented to the Development Management Committee as it was considered a 'departure' from some policies in the LDP. The property was the last in a crescent of houses within the rural centre boundary of Dale as defined in LDP2, and adjacent to the green wedge of Dale Meadows. The application area straddled both areas but was largely in the green wedge area which jutted out from the Dale Meadows area to provide a buffer between the more recently developed residential area of Dale and the listed building of Dale Castle.

This application sought permission to extend the curtilage of 131 Castle Way to provide an off-road parking area for the dwelling occupants. The properties in the crescent were built with garages located to the rear, however these were too small to accommodate modern vehicles, and except for one recently approved application for private parking, all residents of the crescent relied on parking in the nearby lay-by, street parking, or parking on the verge. This proposed parking area was essentially a strip of woodland/scrub in the green wedge and immediately adjacent to and west of the host dwelling curtilage. The proposed development incorporated a Pembrokeshire hedgebank consisting of a minimum 10 no. native trees to border the western side of the driveway fringing the existing woodland. The majority length of the driveway as proposed would have permeable surfacing such as grasscrete, with an access apron of concrete or bitumac. It was also proposed to use building stone from the deconstructed wall edging the road to construct new walls at the entrance splay. A stepped terrace with retaining walls would manage the difference in levels in the garden.

It was noted that Dale had a single-track one-way system through the village. Therefore the development of a parking area adjacent to the curtilage of the property had the potential to reduce the negative impact of parking and traffic at this western end of Castle Way. It might positively impact the special qualities of the National Park and Dale Rural Centre by reducing the amount of verge parking and associated visual clutter alongside the listed Walled Garden. In addition to directly improving the setting of the Walled Garden, it could also improve the setting of the listed St James Church and Dale Castle, where views from the latter overlook Dale Meadows and Castle Way.



Following initial consultation feedback from the Authority's Tree and Landscape Officer, a revised design had been submitted. This amended proposal resulted in the retention of more trees on and adjacent to the site, including retention of the three trees in the site area. The loss of five trees overall would be mitigated through a landscaping scheme which included the installation of a typical Pembrokeshire hedgebank boundary (along the western side and across the top) plus typical planting of a woodland edge.

The proposal would result in the loss of a small area of the green wedge, however a condition controlling the use of the land would ensure that the use remained generally open in nature and a further condition would ensure appropriate planting of native species. The majority of the Green Wedge would remain and fulfil the protection purpose of the designation defined in Policy 16 of LDP2.

Overall, the proposed scheme was considered to be acceptable in terms of scale, form, use and design. The development would not cause an unacceptably detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park. It was not considered that the development would cause an unacceptable impact upon privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties. Impacts on Ecology and landscape features were considered acceptable.

As such, the proposal complied with policies of the adopted Local Development Plan 2 2020 and could be supported. The proposal was also considered to comply with the general policies of Future Wales. The proposal was considered a departure from Policies 7 and 16 of the LDP2, however when assessed against the Plan as a whole and its general aims and when other material considerations were taken into account, the proposal was considered acceptable.

There was one speaker, the applicant Kevin Rogers, speaking on behalf of his wife and himself. He explained that he had lived in Dale for nearly 25 years now, having grown up in the village and moved away. On his return only one property in the crescent was a holiday let, however now only two were lived in permanently. He stated that parking was a serious problem that affected their wellbeing and caused stress. He said that the problem was worse in the summer, but was difficult all year round. The proposal would ameliorate the situation for everyone, but would particularly make life easier for themselves. He explained that the land adjacent to their property was owned by the Dale Estate, who were happy to sell. He said that he loved having the green wedge and wanted to protect it, but felt that the proposal would enhance the area and had happily agreed to the request for a replanting scheme. He concluded by saying that they wanted to continue to live in the village and that this



proposal was key to enabling them to do so. In response to a question from a Member he agreed that failure to obtain planning permission would make them question their long term future in the village. He added that at one time the verge opposite had been planted with daffodils, and therefore the Dale Estate may wish to fence off and restore the garden in the future, which would increase the difficulties in parking. He noted that the small layby was often full with visitors who were staying the holiday let properties in the crescent, however at other times it was used by visitors to Dale when the car park was full. This often caused congestion as a result of the one-way system, particularly when large agricultural vehicles were trying to pass.

One Member asked about the compensatory planting scheme and the officer advised that submission of a detailed landscaping scheme would be a condition of any permission. Members were also concerned that the application could set a precedent for further erosion of the green wedge elsewhere, however the officer clarified that she believed that this was the only house in Dale able to make such an application and that in this case there was a definite context for recommending approval. The officer also clarified that creation of the parking spaces would help the existing parking situation in this part of the village, but would not remedy the situation. Finally another Member noted that parking in Dale was difficult, particularly in the summer when the car park was regularly over capacity, and that there was so much illegal parking that it was impossible to enforce. He welcomed this application which would help ease the problem. The recommendation of approval was proposed and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, highways and landscaping.

[The following two applications were discussed together, however a separate decision was taken on each. Councillor D Clements and Dr R Heath Davies tendered their apologies and left the meeting during their consideration.]

[The meeting was adjourned during the course of the officer's presentation, but prior to the speakers' presentation, due to technical issues.]



- (h) REFERENCE: NP/22/0482/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Titterton
PROPOSAL: Remodelling of front facade and altering existing flat roof to form roof terrace
LOCATION: Goscar House, Crackwell Street, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7BY
- (i) REFERENCE: NP/22/0483/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Griffiths
PROPOSAL: Remodelling of front facade and altering existing flat roof to form roof terrace
LOCATION: Sea House, Crackwell Street, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7BY

It was reported that these applications were before the Committee as the recommendation of Tenby Town Council differed to that of officers.

Goscar House and Sea House fronted onto Crackwell Street, within Tenby Conservation Area. Both three-storey houses formed part of a development granted planning permission in 2016, remodelling a storage depot serving a retail frontage on High Street. The façade emulated the Victorian style of the town, detailed in painted render with timber canted bay/sash windows. There was a flat roof behind a low parapet.

Planning permission was sought for the remodelling of the facade to reflect the traditional Victorian buildings of the town and alteration of the existing flat roof to form a roof terrace at each property through raising the front parapet to remove the existing step between the parapets of each house; construction of an upstand roof around the sides and rear of both properties with hipped corners and clad in slate; a central roof extension to provide the bulkhead for an internal access stair to the roof terrace; and the creation of a viable roof terrace to each house.

Officers did not consider that the proposed roof terrace paid regard to place and local distinctiveness as although roof terraces and balconies existed across Tenby's north front, these were not of roof-top form, having no real impact on Tenby's roof-scape. In contrast, the current proposal was for a roof-top terrace over two prominent sea-front properties, and the scale and design were considered alien. It was also considered that the proposed roof terrace would create visual intrusion on the quality of the environment currently enjoyed by people living near to the development. While the roof upstand at 1700mm would offer a degree of screening, it also created a feature that would appear overbearing to the immediate neighbours in Northcliffe House and Tiffany House. In terms of the wider impact on the environment, the creation of a large rooftop terrace in this prominent location was considered intrusive and incompatible with the



surroundings.

The proposals were also not considered to preserve the setting of the surrounding listed buildings or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. When viewed from the harbour area as part of the streetscape, the proposed hipped design and use of natural slate would provide a degree of traditional form and recessive material, but from many angles the false form of the roof bounding the terraces would be apparent, notably when furnished and in use.

While the remodelling of the front façade was considered beneficial to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and was welcomed, the proposed scheme when taken as a whole was considered contrary to the relevant policies set out in the LDP2 and Planning Policy Wales. The roof terrace was considered to cause an unacceptable level of adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties due to its overbearing nature and would not preserve or enhance Tenby Conservation Area or the setting of surrounding listed buildings. As such, the application was recommended for refusal.

It was reported at the meeting that an ecological report in respect of bats and birds (nesting seagulls) had been received since writing the report and this showed there was no evidence of bats and that the flat roof would remain capable of hosting nesting gulls at appropriate times of the year. It had been reviewed by the Ecologist who was content with the conclusions.

The first speaker was Geoff Downes who owned a flat in an adjacent property and was objecting to the applications. He referred to the numerous objections that had been submitted in respect of loss of amenity, privacy, noise, overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing, health and safety issues and visual intrusion and assumed that these had been taken into consideration by the Committee. He then focused on what he believed was the key point that a dangerous precedent would be set by the roof development as he felt it was out of keeping with the rest of Tenby as it ran to the line of the street frontage unlike other similar developments. He believed that the Tenby skyline was iconic and should be protected and that the proposals would have a serious detrimental impact on the panoramic view and landscape which had remained largely unchanged for decades. He noted that other roof terraces were set back from the street level frontage, which made them discrete and scarcely visible from external viewpoints. He also pointed out that the gradual stepping up of the roof levels on Crackwell Street was in keeping with the gradient of the hill and had a pleasing effect and made no intrusions to the skyline, while the proposals before the Committee went directly against this principle. He therefore considered it would trigger other properties to



apply for similar terraces which would create an eyesore of washing lines and associated paraphernalia which would change the skyline irrevocably.

One of the applicants, Chris Titterton, and the Agent, Tim Colquhoun, then addressed the Committee, sharing the 5 minutes speaking time. Mr Titterton explained that he lived permanently with his family in one of the properties; they had three 10 year old children who attended primary school in the Town and the whole family were actively involved with various groups in the community. He explained that the family had no outside space whatsoever, and apart from providing a visual enhancement, seeking a safe outside space where the children could play was an important consideration in submitting the application. The house also had no secondary means of escape in the event of a fire. He asked Members to approve the application. The Agent, who was also the Architect, then spoke. He referred to Policy 29 Sustainable Design, noting that having an outdoor space was a key requirement for sustainable housing, also as this dwelling had only one external wall, the ventilation was inadequate and any movement away from reliance on fossil fuels relied on heat recovery units and heat pumps, both of which were discretely incorporated within the design. Turning to the visibility of the scheme, it was noted that the roof terrace would not be visible from the Harbour as the view was too acute and screened by the front façade. It would only really be visible from Castle Hill, from which seven terraces were currently visible, including their screens, railings, chairs, etc. He therefore contended that the proposal would improve the situation as it would partially screen both them, and the new terrace area. With regard to amenity and the impact on the holiday flats at the rear, the Architect noted that the mansard was only marginally higher than a boundary fence that was allowed under permitted development, and he found it difficult to see how this could be considered to be overbearing; the terraces to the rear were open to each other and would be screened by the upstand; it was difficult to see how their privacy could be affected when it was already compromised.

With regard to the visual impact of the proposal from Castle Hill, the views of the roof would be distant and would not be a prominent feature. He believed that the large flat roof was out of character with the other mansard roofs in the street and the missing mansards were conspicuous by their absence. Combined with the improvements to the elevations, the mansard roofs would preserve and enhance the streetscene and the Conservation Area. Mr Colquhoun noted that the full Cadw response was not included in the report before Members and he stated that this said that the development was in a similar style to that of neighbouring properties and that while there might be a slight visual change in the view from the castle it would not affect the way it was experience or appreciated, and the application would have no impact on the setting of the Scheduled



Ancient Monument. As this was the only viewpoint, the Architect said he found it difficult to see how there could be any other negative impact. Finally he noted that the design of the roof terrace was almost identical to a recently completed development further down Crackwell Street which had been supported by the Authority. There, the raised parapet obscured the terrace with minimal visual impact, such that people would not realise it was there, and he believed the same would be true of the applications under consideration.

Some Members noted that looking from the harbour it would be impossible to see chairs and umbrellas as they would be too small and the angle was wrong. They considered that the frontage would be enhanced and would fit with other properties within the street. It was also noted that a family lived in the property, and were one of the few residents in that street. The children had a right to play and the family gave a lot to the community; unless people lived in the town, it could not be sustained. It was therefore proposed and seconded that the applications be approved as the development was consistent with the Conservation Area and would be an enhancement, adding to the town's special qualities. The application would also support the community by allowing people to live in the area.

While other Members expressed their sympathy for the applicant, they noted that the decision had to be based on policy reasons rather than personal circumstances and the Authority's legal adviser concurred that this was rarely a material consideration and the right of children to play was a consideration which had to be considered proportionately. Some Members were also concerned about the impact on listed buildings in the area and on the Conservation Area and that approving the application would set a precedent for development of other rooftops in that area, as well as the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

The Solicitor and officers clarified that the duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, applied also to the preservation of its setting, and that there was a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The Director clarified that were Members minded to go against the officer recommendation, she would not invoke the Authority's 'Cooling Off' period as it was a matter of interpretation of the design policy, however she suggested that the application be delegated to officers to approve, subject to agreeing conditions with the Chair and Deputy Chair.

DECISION: That application NP/22/0482/FUL be delegated to officers



to approve subject to conditions being agreed with the Chair and Deputy Chair.

DECISION: That application NP/22/0483/FUL be delegated to officers to approve subject to conditions being agreed with the Chair and Deputy Chair.

[Mr G Jones and Mrs J James tendered their apologies and left the meeting after the vote had been taken.]

In terms of the reasons for going against the officer recommendation, these were given by Members as: the proposal was considered consistent with the Conservation Area, and the overall scheme represented an enhancement which would ensure that the property's aspect was more in keeping with the Conservation Area and added to the town's special qualities. The proposal would support sustainable communities. The proposal was in keeping with the existing properties on the sea front and had no greater impact on the setting of the listed building when compared to them. Other roof lines were similar within the Conservation Area. A daylight assessment undertaken by the applicant demonstrated no loss of light to neighbouring properties were the proposal to be implemented. The proposal was not considered to have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties.

- (j) 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 was a revised application following an application in 2020 which was refused under delegated powers under reference number: NP/20/0220/FUL. Given the prominence of this site within the National Park, and that part of the site was within the Coastal Change Zone it was considered that Members would benefit from seeing the site prior to its consideration at the next Development Management Committee.



DECISION: That the Committee undertake a Site Inspection prior to consideration of the application at a future meeting.

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 Officer reported that a decision on the appeal in respect of Pantmaenog was still awaited from the Minister, however a summary of the reasons why it had been called in had been circulated to the Committee as requested at the last meeting.

It was reported that the appeal in respect of polytunnels to house laying hens throughout the winter months at a field on the north side of Jason Road, Freshwater East (NP/22/0003/PNA) had been allowed and a copy of the Inspector's decision was attached for information. The officer noted that the Inspector had declined to impose a condition in respect of lighting as this was not included as part of the application. There had also been an application for costs in respect of this appeal, however that had been refused.

One Member was disappointed that no lighting condition had been imposed due to the importance of biodiversity in a National Park and asked that an observation in this regard could be made to the Inspectorate. The Solicitor reminded the Committee that although representations could be made, the decision could not be reversed other than by way of judicial review proceedings.

Another Member asked whether there had been any progress regarding the appeal at Trewern Farm in Nevern, and the officer reminded the Committee that the Inspector had granted an extension to allow for negotiations to take place between the applicant and Natural Resources Wales, however this had not been possible. A meeting with the agent was due to take place in the near future and a further update would be provided in due course.

NOTED.

The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee on 1 February 2023 subject to the following amendment:

Councillor C Williams asked that it be recorded that he took no part in the discussion on NP/22/0388/FUL (Kenmore) and abstained from voting.

