

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

10 March 2021

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

Councillor P Baker BEM, Mrs D Clements, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor M Evans, Councillor P Harries, Dr M Havard, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs S Hoss, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor PJ Morgan, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 11.25am; 11.35am - 1.20pm]

## 1. Apologies

There were no apologies for absence. However Mr Charles Felgate, the Solicitor, had advised that he was having difficulty connecting to the meeting.

## 2. Disclosures of interest

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

<b>Application and Reference</b>	<b>Member(s)/Officer(s)</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
<i>Minutes 6(c)below</i> NP/20/0407/FUL Demolition of existing garage/workshop, and other extensions.	Councillor P Baker	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
Modernisation of existing building and new two storey extension to form a change in use to provide Key worker accommodation (C3 class) which comprises, 18 No. self-contained studio rooms. The proposal provides 9 No. parking spaces at the front and rear of the property with one being a disabled space. There is also provision for six cycle stands at the rear -	Councillor M Evans Mrs J James	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting on the application



Coed-derw, St. Brides  
Hill, Saundersfoot

*Minutes 6(g)below*  
NP/20/0614

Dr RM Plummer

Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting on the application

6 affordable houses in association with 6 woodworking workshops, a community facility and a timber processing and drying facility - Pantmaenog Forest, Rosebush, Clunderwen, Pembrokeshire, SA66 7QY

### 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 27 January 2021 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 27 January 2021 be confirmed and authenticated.

**NOTED.**

### 4. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak (*the interested parties are listed below against their respective application(s), and in the order in which they addressed the Committee*):

<b>Reference number</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
NP/20/04838FUL <i>Minute 6(d) refers</i>	Change of use of hotel to single dwelling with 9 bed staff quarters retained - St Davids Court (Formerly The Warpole Court Hotel, St Davids	Andrew Vaughan-Harries – Agent
NP/20/0421/OUT	Demolition of existing industrial buildings &	Andrew Vaughan-Harries – Agent



<i>Minute 6(e) refers</i>	erection of two dwellings (all matters reserved) - Former GWLA Works, Rear of 89 Nun Street, St Davids	
NP/20/0576/FUL <i>Minute 6(f) refers</i>	Proposed relocation of existing café to new building with associated external patio area - St Ishmaels Garden Centre, St Ishmaels	Andrew Vaughan-Harries - Agent
NP/20/0614/FUL <i>Minute 6(g) Refers</i>	6 affordable houses in association with 6 woodworking workshops, a community facility and a timber processing and drying facility – Pantmaenog Forest, Rosebush, Clunderwen	Tony Pasternak – Nolton & Roch Community Land Trust Mark McKenna – 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, the Authority's 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.

As the Solicitor did not join the meeting until a little later in the meeting, his report was taken as read.

## 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*):

The Chair reminded the Committee that a supplemental agenda had been sent to them, and he would be taking the report contained on it first.



- (a) REFERENCE: NP/21/0137/FUL  
APPLICANT: Bluestone Resorts Ltd.  
PROPOSAL: Removal of a timber structure, installation of holiday lodges, welcome lodge, communal hub structures, buggy park and photo-voltaic shelter and guest car park, with associated infrastructure including internal circulation roads, hard and soft landscaping, drainage infrastructure, retaining walls and earth bunding. This forms the main part of a wider development proposal that is otherwise located within Pembrokeshire County Council  
LOCATION: Bluestone National Park Resort, Canaston Wood, Narberth

It was reported this development was located on land used as part of the existing resort and was a cross boundary application with development within the jurisdiction of both Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority and Pembrokeshire County Council.

As the proposed development was a major development which extended an existing major development within the National Park, it was requested that Members consider a Committee site visit to view the site and surroundings prior to consideration of the planning application at a subsequent Committee meeting.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred and a site visit undertaken.**

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/19/0328/S73  
APPLICANT: Mr G Perfect  
PROPOSAL: Variation of condition no. 2 of NP/14/0014 – Residential Development Plot adjoining D  
LOCATION: Plots adjoining Devon Court, 5, Freshwater East, Pembroke

It was reported that the above-mentioned application would not be considered by the Committee that day due to a procedural matter which had been brought to officers' attention. The application would be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

**NOTED.**

[Councillor P Baker had disclosed a prejudicial interest in the following application and withdrew from the meeting while it was being considered.]



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/20/0407/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr A Evans  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing garage/workshop, and other extensions. Modernisation of existing building and new two storey extension to form a change in use to provide Key worker accommodation (C3 class) which comprises, 18 No. self-contained studio rooms. The proposal provides 9 No. parking spaces at the front and rear of the property with one being a disabled space. There is also provision for six cycle stands at the rear  
LOCATION: Coed-derw, St Brides Hill, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9NP

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the January meeting of the Committee, when it had been deferred to allow Saundersfoot Community Council to be consulted on amended plans.

It was reported that the site comprised a large residential property which had been converted at some point in the past to provide some holiday accommodation which included rear extensions to provide additional accommodation and fire exits.

The report before the Committee had been updated to reflect that Saundersfoot Community Council supported the amended scheme, and also to take account of the further amended drawing which had been submitted following the last meeting. It was reported at the meeting that additional drawings had been received by the Authority on the previous Friday which addressed a requirement for ecological enhancements. These had been forwarded to the Authority's Ecologist, however no response had been received to date. It was also noted that Members had received correspondence from the Agent.

Whilst officers had concluded that the principle of the proposal was acceptable and would have no additional impact on the character of the building when viewed from the street scene, they still considered that the proposed scale, form and overall mass of the proposed rear extension in the amended scheme would result in an overbearing impact on the amenity of neighbours and constituted over development of the site. As such the proposed development in its current form was considered to be contrary to several policies within LDP2 and could not be supported by officers in this instance. The recommendation was one of refusal and this was moved and seconded.

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



- 1. Policy 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 does not support development where it has an unacceptable impact on amenity. The proposed development due to its scale, form, massing and siting is considered to cause an adverse impact on neighbours' amenity and will result in an overbearing impact on neighbouring dwellings. The proposed development also fails to conserve or enhance the special qualities of this area of the National Park. The application is therefore considered to be contrary the adopted Local Development Plan 2, Policy 8 (Special Qualities), Policy 14 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), Policy 29 (Sustainable Design) and Policy 30 (Amenity).**
  
- 2. The proposed two storey extension will extend into the rear garden area some 15.9 metres when measured from the original rear elevation of the dwelling. This is considered by officers to have a scale of development that results in overdevelopment of the site. The application is therefore considered to be contrary the adopted Local Development Plan 2, Policy 8 (Special Qualities), Policy 14 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), Policy 29 (Sustainable Design) and Policy 30 (Amenity).**

*[The Chair took the following application out of order of the agenda]*

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/20/0483/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr P Trier  
PROPOSAL: Change of use of hotel to single dwelling with 9 bed staff quarters retained  
LOCATION: St David's Court (formerly the Warpool Court Hotel), St Davids, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6BN

It was reported that this property was a Grade II listed building built in 1870 for the headmaster of St Davids Cathedral Choir School for his own family and the chorister boarders. In 1955 it had been converted to a 22 bed country house hotel and this had been its lawful use for the last 66 years.

The application, which was before the Committee for consideration as the officer's recommendation differed from the response of the City Council, did not propose any physical alterations to the property, only the change of use from hotel to private residential. Listed Building Consent had already been granted to allow for the removal of modern internal partitions in tandem with its proposed use as a single dwelling.

Officers considered that, based on the information provided, the proposal met with the requirements of Policy 38 of LDP2 which sought to prevent



unnecessary loss of the hotels. Also the use of the property as a large residence instead of a hotel would have negligible change on the rural character of its surroundings.

However the conversion of the hotel to a single dwelling would require the payment of a commuted sum as a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing provision under Policy 48 of LDP2 (as a new open market dwelling had been created). The report set out the calculations for this sum, and due to the large floor area, this stood at £330,575. No viability challenge had been submitted to offset this figure, although the planning statement submitted by the applicant had declared the requirement for affordable housing to be both unreasonable and unnecessary.

The officer advised the Committee that the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on affordable housing did suggest that the Authority would expect applicants to have demonstrated how they had improved the viability of schemes by considering alternative designs. In this case, there had been no consideration of alternative uses, and how these might also enable a contribution towards affordable housing or even on-site affordable housing provision, for example by converting the hotel to flats. Officers concluded that in the absence of an agreement to provide a commuted sum, the application could not be supported, and the recommendation was one of refusal.

The Agent, Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries then addressed the Committee. He began by listing the positive aspects of this application – listed building consent had been granted for change of use to a fine gentleman's house and officers had not expressed concerns regarding the loss of the hotel. However one issue remained outstanding and this was whether it was fair and reasonable for the applicant to write a cheque for one third of a million pounds. He stated that in 1870 the house had been built in connection with the cathedral and it had remained in this use for 88 years. It had then been a hotel for 63 years. The hotel had now been closed for 2 years and had been placed on the market, however no sale had taken place. This situation had been made worse by the pandemic and the applicant had then had the idea to return the hotel to a house – the separate staff quarters would still be needed to help run the complex. With regard to the viability assessment, Mr Vaughan-Harries advised that as there was very little work to change the hotel back to a house, the assessment would not suggest any way to significantly reduce the ludicrous sum required. He didn't believe that the Supplementary Planning Guidance had been written with this type of application in mind. He therefore asked that Members take a common-sense decision to grant permission to allow the hotel to revert back to a house. Otherwise his



client had a property he did not wish to run as a hotel, but could not live in; as a result the property would deteriorate.

Members asked whether there was any flexibility in the sum to be paid or scope for the property to be marketed subject to payment of the contribution. The agent advised that it had been marketed as a hotel for 2-3 years nationwide and at auction without success. However it had not been marketed as a house as the question would be asked regarding planning permission and buyers would then become aware of the contribution required.

The officer advised that there was evidence that stately homes had become more desirable as a result of the pandemic and suggested that there may be a buyer willing to make the contribution. She added that the calculation of the contribution was set out in the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance and the process to challenge that sum was submission of a viability assessment. Another Member asked about the timing of the contribution and the officer advised that this was normally paid on first occupation. The period for submission of the Unilateral Agreement was usually 3 months, however a longer period could be agreed to allow a longer marketing period.

Members hoped that a viability assessment would be submitted as part of a future application and that this might allow negotiation of a sum to be paid that was acceptable to all parties. A motion of refusal was proposed and seconded.

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

- 1. The applicant does not propose to enter into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the necessary commuted sum towards affordable housing as is required by Policy 48 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 (2020) and the Authority's interim Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.**

*[Councillor M James asked that it be noted that he abstained from voting on the above mentioned application as had had lost connection and not heard all of the debate.]*





- (e) REFERENCE: NP/20/0421/OUT  
APPLICANT: Mr D Harries  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing industrial buildings & erection of two dwellings (all matters reserved)  
LOCATION: Former GWLA Concrete Works, Rear of 89, Nun Street, St Davids, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6NU

It was reported that the application was being presented to the Committee as the officer's recommendation differed to that of the City Council. The site lay within the centre boundary for St Davids and was brownfield land comprising industrial land, buildings and concrete hardstanding associated with GWLA concrete works and more recently used as a builder's yard.

Officers had concluded that such a brownfield site close to a wide range of services and facilities without the need for reliance on a car was rare. Although submitted in outline, with all matters reserved, the proposal indicated two large detached dwellings. However, based on the Authority's policy to make efficient use of land for development, officers considered that there was a potential to develop this site for 4 modest dwellings, including one affordable dwelling, the context for which was established within the vicinity and immediately adjacent to the site. Insufficient evidence had been provided within the current application to show that such a scheme was not possible, and the recommendation was one of refusal, with the lack of provision of a unilateral undertaking to secure a contribution towards affordable housing forming a second reason for refusal.

It was reported at the meeting that a further representation had been made by the Agent stating that his client was willing to submit a unilateral agreement should planning permission be granted. Also a higher density of housing was not possible due to the access. The Highway Authority had indicated that no more than 5 dwellings should be provided on the site.

The Agent, Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries, then addressed the Committee. He confirmed that his client was happy to sign a unilateral undertaking, however given the recommendation of refusal he had wished to avoid unnecessary costs. He advised that should the application be approved, an agreement would be submitted within a month. Mr Vaughan-Harries went on to explain that his client was a builder approaching retirement and used the site as builder's yard. It was pointed out that only 12 years ago, permission had been granted for a single dwelling on the site, however it was acknowledged that this pre-dated the current Local Development Plan; the indicative scheme now submitted was for two units. It was noted that this scheme was supported by St Davids City



Council as it would improve the visual and environmental impact of the site. The Highway Authority had also blessed the scheme, having initially said that there were limits to the number of dwellings that the site could accommodate due to the constraints of the access – its width and visibility. There was also a popular Right of Way which used the lane, and as it was unlikely ever to be adopted, no pavement would be provided.

Mr Vaughan-Harries went on to note that Policy 51 required a minimum density unless it could be demonstrated that there were problems, and he argued that this was the case with this site due to the poor access, lack of pavements, poor visibility and the use of the lane by walkers accessing the Right of Way. He also stated that the lane afforded access to garages belonging to three further properties and he believed that this had not been taken into consideration in the calculations of vehicles using the lane.

The Agent went on to say that the other problem with having a higher density of dwellings on the site related to a requirement for a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS), and as his client did not own any adjacent land, he was concerned that there was insufficient land into which the water could drain. As a final point, he also doubted that the Housing Association would be interested in taking on a single dwelling, preferring to deal with larger sites.

One Member asked whether any calculations had been made regarding the surface water drainage, and the Agent replied that no such calculations had been made as these were usually undertaken by a specialist engineer after planning permission had been obtained, however as his client was a builder, he had a level of knowledge in this matter, as did the Agent himself. He also confirmed that no approach had been made to the Housing Association regarding their willingness to manage a single dwelling.

The officer replied that SUDS had improved in recent years and could now make use of land beneath roads and parking areas. She also noted that only one property made regular use of the lane to access a garage, with the other garages being accessed in other ways.

Some Members questioned the density on an adjacent site, however officers did not have the information to hand and noted that as the application had been approved under LDP1, the policy context had been different and it was therefore difficult to compare the two sites.

Members agreed that this was a rare opportunity to meaningfully develop a brownfield site for the benefit of the community, and did not believe that



the application before them achieved this aim. A motion to refuse the application was moved and seconded. They suggested that the applicant should increase the density and hoped that an acceptable compromise could be reached in submission of a future application.

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

- 1. The proposed density of the development does not accord with the requirements of Policy 51 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 and guidance within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 10, December 2018).**
- 2. No unilateral undertaking to secure a contribution towards affordable housing has been provided and the application is therefore contrary to Policy 49 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2.**

*The Meeting was adjourned between 11.25 and 11.35am.*

*[Councillor A Wilcox was not present during consideration of the following application]*

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/20/0576/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr S Joules  
PROPOSAL: Proposed relocation of existing café to new building with associated external patio area  
LOCATION: St Ishmaels Garden Centre, St Ishmaels, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3SX

It was reported that this proposal sought to provide improved café facilities and to alter the layout of the garden centre for the benefit of the business and customers. The existing café area would be re-used as a staff room and additional garden centre retail display area.

The Director advised that she had placed the application on the Committee agenda as previous applications on this site had been the subject of much debate by the Committee.

The report advised that the proposed scheme was considered to be acceptable and would not have an adverse impact on this area of the National Park, would have no impact on nearby Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and was of a scale, form and design that was appropriate for this type of development. The impact on residential amenity was considered acceptable, and conditions would be imposed to ensure that the primary function of the site remained as a garden centre as it was in a



countryside location. Other conditions could be included to protect existing trees and hedges and to control the impact of lighting on biodiversity.

It was therefore concluded that the development was in keeping with the aims of local and national policy and could be supported subject to a schedule of suitable conditions. The recommendation was one of approval.

The Agent, Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries then addressed the Committee. He advised that this was a successful business which had been the subject of significant investment by the owner in recent years. As the old café was looking shabby, permission was sought to relocate it to a more manageable and attractive location. The Agent confirmed that it would contain a disabled toilet and that an additional full time job would be created. He noted that the site was well screened and the applicant was happy with the suggested conditions. He therefore hoped that Members would endorse the recommendation of approval that was before them.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the application, accordance with approved plans and documents, protection of trees and hedges, lighting, finished floor levels, use for sales of gardening products with ancillary café use only, opening hours and a cessation of the use of the existing café building for that purpose following its relocation.**

*[Councillor A Wilcox returned to the meeting during consideration of the following application and therefore abstained from voting.]*

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/20/0614/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms J Holding  
PROPOSAL: 6 affordable houses in association with 6 woodworking workshops, a community facility and a timber processing and drying facility  
LOCATION: Pantmaenog Forest, Rosebush, Clunderwen, Pembrokeshire, SA66 7QY

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as it was a major application and formed a departure from the Local Development Plan 2. The proposal sought permission for 6 detached two storey houses arranged in an arc around a central workshop building and linked (through occupation criteria) to 6 internal workshops within this building which also incorporated a central atrium space with WCs, kitchenette and office space. This central area was proposed to be made available for community use in addition to a small meeting room located in the corner of the building; the officer clarified in the meeting that she believed she



had misinterpreted such a community use and understood that the space would be used for training by Down to Earth, the social enterprise which would run the facility. There was also proposed to be a separate timber-processing/sawmill & drying building on the eastern end of the development site.

The site was in a countryside location, north-west of Rosebush village and separated from the edge of the Centre boundary by undeveloped land in agricultural and forestry use. Due to its location, officers considered that the proposal was contrary, in principle, to national and local planning policies that sought to control development in the countryside. Insufficient information had been provided to show that this particular location was essential to the proposal and officers noted that they would have been more supportive of a scheme located adjacent to the village of Rosebush.

In addition, the proposed affordable housing did not meet the accepted definition of affordable housing as there was no demonstration of how the properties would be let and managed by a registered social landlord nor a legal agreement to ensure they were affordable in the first instance and in perpetuity. The business was not yet established and no business plan had been submitted, while the link between the houses and workshops was not satisfactorily explained.

While creating an opportunity for some house occupants to live and work in close proximity, the sustainability of the proposal in terms of the wider needs of its occupants was diminished by the remote location and a likely dependency on private transport, as journeys involving public transport to larger centres with a good range of services and facilities would be lengthy. The site would be clearly visible within a protected National Park and Historic landscape from a wide area to the north, extending to the top of the Preseli Hills and would appear as an isolated development in the countryside. The recommendation was therefore one of refusal, however it was noted that were Members minded to approve the application, the consent of Welsh Government would have to be obtained as a result of a recently published Circular.

At the meeting, Members reported that they had received additional information from the applicant both by email and post, and the officer noted that the applicants had submitted a number of reports since her report had been written, including a landscape assessment. Cadw had responded to this document and as a result Condition 2 as set out in the report was no longer needed. However interim advice for planning applications that had the potential to increase phosphate levels in river Special Areas of Conservation had recently been published by Natural Resources Wales and this was relevant to this application. The ecologist



had requested further information from the applicant and as this had not yet been provided, it was requested that this formed a replacement reason for refusal.

The officer added that, contrary to what the applicants had said, the development could not be considered as a rural enterprise as it did not meet the criteria set out in Technical Advice Note (TAN) 6. Neither could it be considered as a One Planet Development as the occupiers had to prove that they were making an income from the land, however as they would not own the forestry, this could not be demonstrated.

The first speaker was Mr Tony Pasternak, a Board Member of Nolton and Roch Community Land Trust (CLT) which had recently been incorporated to provide affordable housing for residents local to Nolton and Roch and those with a local connection. He reminded the Committee of the severe housing shortage across the United Kingdom, made worse by the loss of housing stock to second homes, and noted that Pembrokeshire was not immune to this situation, with the Local Development Plans for both the National Park Authority and Pembrokeshire County Council setting ambitious goals for the provision of affordable housing. He stated that the CLT supported this scheme as it embodied many of the attributes of a community led, affordable housing development. However he believed that the scheme at Pantmaenog was about more than the provision of housing, but aimed to contribute to sustainability and to building a circular economy underpinned by renewable energy. With regard to lack of public transport, he believed that electric vehicles were the future, and he referred to an affordable housing scheme elsewhere in Pembrokeshire which operated a shared electric car and charge point. He understood that the innovative approach to living and working that was proposed did not provide a perfect overlay on the Authority's purpose of protecting the landscape, however he recognised that the applicants had put a lot of effort into this project and there was a lot of support for it, both locally and nationally. Mr Pasternak therefore hoped that the Authority and applicant could work together to find a solution to achieve what could be a flagship project for Pembrokeshire and to provide greater momentum for affordable housing in Pembrokeshire.

The Agent, Mr Mark McKenna then addressed the Committee. He explained that he was the Co-founder and Managing Director of Down to Earth, a social enterprise based on the Gower Peninsula with a 15 year track record, and an international reputation, for managing health care and education infrastructure for the most vulnerable in society. The organisation had three sites on the Gower, of which he clarified two were educational, and one under construction which would provide 6 houses in association with the Coastal Housing Group. The latter project used the model that was being proposed at Pantmaenog, and being based on



Gower, also demonstrated the organisation's understanding of designated landscapes. Mr McKenna went on to state that he did not believe that the report before the Committee was objective or balanced and he had therefore sent out additional information to Members prior to the meeting. He also believed that the application complied with policies 7, 43, 49 and 54 of LDP2, noting that interpretation of these was subjective.

Mr McKenna believed that there was a fundamental misunderstanding of the scheme, which was not about housing, but about supporting economic development through award winning forestry. He stated that everyone knew there was a need for jobs, with some people having a desire to live and work in close proximity, and the pandemic had highlighted the flexibility of such a model which eliminated commuting. The development would provide a micro-business spin-out hub for social enterprises connected to woodlands, supporting people to develop sustainable businesses through the security of a 7 year tenure. He confirmed that the houses would remain affordable in perpetuity.

The Agent noted that the site currently had permission for a timber processing and drying shed in a more visually intrusive location, and believed that the visual impact of this proposed development would not be as great. He believed that all other objections could be overcome. He stated that there was overwhelming support for the project, and pointed to £2m funding from Welsh Government and other funders, however this was time sensitive and had to be spent by the end of March. He clarified that he believed this was achievable were planning permission to be granted by the Committee that day. He concluded by asking Members to support a life changing and economically regenerating opportunity.

Members asked a number of questions of Mr McKenna and some of the clarification provided has been set out in the above paragraphs. They expressed concern about occupation of the dwellings by people from outside Pembrokeshire, and where the occupants would live once their 7 year tenure came to an end. Mr McKenna further explained that the development would be constructed by adults and young people referred by the Health Board and local charities, and they would be given the first opportunity to have a tenancy. However he provided assurances that the tenants would all come from the Pembrokeshire Housing register. Mr McKenna noted that the suggestion for the housing to be located adjacent to the village of Rosebush was given too late for a revised scheme to be considered by Welsh Government with regard to funding.

While Members were supportive of the aims of the project, concern was expressed regarding the sensitive location of the development, including its impact on the Welsh language, and also regarding the submission of a



large amount of information late in the process which would have benefitted from greater dialogue with officers, and potentially a site inspection by the Committee. However it was acknowledged that in the circumstances there was insufficient time for this to happen. Members were also concerned to hear Mr McKenna's view that the officer's report was not balanced and disagreed with this view, defending the officer as a Senior Planner with the Authority and commending her professionalism.

The recommendation, with the replacement of the second reason for refusal with one regarding the impact of the development on the SAC, was moved and seconded.

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

- 1. The proposed development by virtue of its open countryside location will have a harmful impact on the special qualities of the national park, and is contrary to both national and local planning policies, specifically Policies 7, 8, 9 & 15 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2020) and the principles of PPW 10 (Edition 10, December 2018).**
- 2. There is insufficient information in support of the application to determine the impact of the development on the River Cleddau Special Area of Conservation. The proposal does not therefore accord with the requirements of Policy 10 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 (2020).**
- 3. The dwellings are positioned with insufficient amenity space away from industrial production areas and are therefore contrary to the principles of Policy 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2020).**

*[Councillor M James asked that it be noted that he abstained from voting on the above mentioned application as had had lost connection and not heard all of the debate.]*

Dr R Plummer, Dr R Heath Davies, Councillor P Kidney and Councillor M Evans tendered their apologies and left the meeting at this juncture.

## **7. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 3 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.





In addition it was noted that a further appeal had recently been submitted in relation to NP/19/0522 Buttyland Caravan and Camping Park Manorbier and initial documents had been provided to the Planning Inspectorate.

**NOTED.**

The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 21 April 2021 without amendment

