

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

10 June 2020

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

Councillor P Baker, Mrs D Clements, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor M Evans, Councillor P Harries, Dr M Havard, 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

[Virtual Meeting 10.00am – 12.10pm; 12.20pm – 1.30pm]

1. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Dr R Heath-Davies.

2. Disclosures of interest

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

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minutes 6(b) below</i> NP/19/0361/OUT Outline application with all matters reserved for 102 affordable residential units, 8 shared ownership residential units and 34 open market residential units together with associated access, drainage & landscaping, Land at Brynhir, Tenby	Councillor M James Councillor M Evans	Personal rather than prejudicial Interest. The Members remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions thereon.

The Monitoring Officer reminded the Committee and members of the public that the Authority's Standards Committee had granted a dispensation to Members appointed by Pembrokeshire County Council (PCC) on 28 June 2017 to allow them to determine issues related to PCC. However he noted that the granting of such a dispensation did not preclude the operation of any other part of the Code of Conduct.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 29 January 2020 and 10 February 2020 were presented for confirmation authentication.



It was noted that the second paragraph of Minute 6 of 29 January 2020 referred to the Environment (Wales) Act and Historic Environment (Wales) Act as having been introduced at the same time as the Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act. This was incorrect as both came into being the following year. It was therefore requested that the words “at the same time as” be replaced with “following”.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on the 29 January 2020 and 10 February 2020 be confirmed and authenticated subject to the above amendment.

NOTED.

4. Right to speak at Committee

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

Reference number	Proposal	Speaker
NP/19/0309 <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	A One Planet Development to include a cabin, shed, livestock barn, produce barn, compost toilet, greenhouse, farmgate stall and removal of hedgerow to create car parking area (part retrospective) - Lily Pond Farm, Whitewell Lane, Penally, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7RY	Cllr J Preston (County Councillor)
NP/19/0361/OUT <i>Minute 6(b) refers</i>	Outline application with all matters reserved for 102 affordable residential units, 8 shared ownership residential units and 34 open market residential units together with associated access, drainage & landscaping. -	Jane Merrony - Tenby Greenspace Liam Hopkins – Agent



Land at Brynhir, Tenby,
Pembrokeshire, SA70 8TT

NP/19/0657/FUL <i>Minute 6(c)</i> <i>refers</i>	Upgrading of existing car parking facility and interpretation boards, cladding of toilets and shelter canopy. - Broad Haven Car Park, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire	Madeline Capel – objector Jonathon Pickford – Agent
---	---	--

5. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report had been updated to include a section regarding ecological considerations and summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, outlining the purpose of the planning system and relevant considerations in decision making, the Authority's duty to carry out sustainable development, ecological considerations, human rights considerations, the Authority's guidance to members on decision-making in committee and also set out some circumstances where costs might be awarded against the Authority on appeal.

The Solicitor also noted that while the Development Plan remained that adopted by the Authority in 2010, this had been undergoing a process of review and a binding Inspector's Report had now been received in respect of the Examination into the Replacement Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (LDP2). This was a material consideration with quite considerable weight and references to it would be made by officers in their reports to the Committee that day.

The Solicitor was asked by one Member to clarify the 'Sandford Principle'. The Solicitor explained that he did not have the wording of the Environment Act 1995 before him and referred members to previous training in that regard.

NOTED

6. Report of Planning Applications

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Development Management Team Leader, together with any updates reported verbally on the day and recorded below. The Committee determined the applications as follows (*the decision reached on each follows the details of the relevant application*):



[Councillor A Wilcox was not present for the entirety of the presentation on the following application and he therefore abstained from voting, while Councillor P Morgan was not present for the vote.]

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/19/0309/FUL
APPLICANT: J & L Reynolds & Lant
PROPOSAL: A One Planet Development to include include a cabin, shed, livestock barn, produce barn, compost toilet, greenhouse, farmgate stall and removal of hedgerow to create car parking area (part retrospective)
LOCATION: Lily Pond Farm, Whitewell Lane, Penally, Tenby

Members were reminded that this application had been deferred at the December meeting of the Committee to allow a site inspection to take place. Members visited the site on 10 February 2020 and the minutes of that meeting had been agreed earlier in the meeting. As it had originally been scheduled to be brought to the postponed 18 March 2020 meeting, consideration of the application had been delayed due to the current Government advice during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Since December, further information relating to the Ecological Footprint Analysis, revised scaled plans (revising the position of the composting toilet), an amended planting/landscaping plan to address the screening of the site from the car parking area and an amended Management Plan had been received. A draft S106 Agreement to tie the ownership of the land and occupation of the dwelling to the proposed use had also been received and had been revised to address concerns over the wording which would have allowed for occupation after retirement, contrary to the OPD guidance. The agent had advised that the revised Agreement had been sent to the Authority's offices, however as these were currently closed the officer informed the Committee that she had, as yet, been unable to locate it. The Agent was asked if a further copy could be provided in the interim.

Officers advised that the documents received had addressed many of their earlier concerns, as set out in the report, and further information in respect of planting/landscaping and a breeding bird survey could be requested through conditions, as well as a condition requiring that use of the shed for residential purposes ceased once the proposed cabin had been constructed.

It was also reported that the Inspector's final report on the revised Local Development Plan had been received by the Authority on 13 May 2020, and that this was a material consideration of significant weight. However it was noted that it did not alter the policy context for this application.



Having considered the proposed One Planet Development against the relevant national and local policy framework, officers considered that the proposed amended Management Plan sufficiently addressed the requirements, and as such the proposed development could be supported, subject to conditions. However it was noted at the meeting that condition 16 had been amended to allow the breeding farmland birds survey to be undertaken within 12 months, rather than over the spring/summer 2020 due to the Covid-19 lockdown requirement. Also as there was some duplication between conditions 13 and 14 as set out in the report, the officer asked that condition 13 be removed from the schedule.

The speaker, Councillor Jonathan Preston, then addressed the Committee. While acknowledging that sustainable living was key to the reduction in pollution that was necessary to address the current climate emergency, he stated that he was unable to support this application despite its obvious merits. He referred to the outrage among the local community in Penally in response to the removal of the ancient hedge bank along Whitewell Lane. Although the agent had acknowledged that his client had made a mistake in taking it down without obtaining planning consent, believing it to be low in plant species and poor in health, Councillor Preston did not believe that ignorance was a defence, and he noted that planning legislation was in place to protect the environment. He also did not consider that the development fitted well within the One Planet Development guidelines as due to its proximity to Penally and Lydstep the residential structure could not be deemed as essential. This provision was to protect the open countryside and support farms. While he supported sustainable development, he wanted to ensure the Committee was comfortable that this was not development in the open countryside and that it fulfilled the objectives of the National Park. Finally he referred the Committee to the Sandford Principle which stated that where irreconcilable conflicts existed between conservation and public enjoyment in National Parks, then conservation interests should take priority. He added that Penally Community Council also objected to the application.

In response to a question from a Member, Councillor Preston confirmed that the concerns of the community centred on removal of the hedgebank and the retrospective nature of part of the application.

Members then had the opportunity to ask questions of the Agent, Tau Wimbush, who was unable to address the Committee as he had done so on a previous occasion. They asked about the adequacy of the water supply, other options for the sale of produce other than at the farm gate which would increase traffic and whether the basic needs of the applicants would be met. The agent replied that the applicants had



undertaken tests and were confident that they would need only a very small percentage of the natural flow and that there would be sufficient water; they also had no doubt that they would be able to meet their basic needs, as they were currently meeting their food, energy and water needs, however it took time to build up to meeting their income needs and the Management Plan allowed for that. He noted that sales from the farm gate would allow the applicants to take advantage of a number of caravan sites within walking distance, but he was sure that an opportunity to sell from the back of a horse and cart would be something his client would be delighted to do, subject to the current social-distancing requirements. Distribution could also be done through a third party.

The officer went on to explain that there had been some confusion over removal of the hedgebank, because a farm access to a field on an unclassified road did not need permission if there was no other means of access and officers were initially unaware that there was another entrance, albeit one that was very wet and difficult. She added that the applicant proposed to plant over 180m of new hedgebank, and she was content that this would mitigate for what had been removed. An application for a rural enterprise had initially been submitted, however this could not include accommodation and had to be prior-notification of work, it had therefore been refused.

Another Member asked whether the Authority's Agricultural Advisor had provided any update, given that his initial response had expressed concern. Officers replied that the advice of the Agricultural Advisor was more relevant to rural enterprise applications than One Planet Developments and he currently had insufficient capacity to undertake additional work. His concerns had been regarding the amount of labour required to generate the necessary income, however this would be monitored in the Annual Monitoring Report. The exit strategy was a key part of this plan, so should targets consistently fail to be met, all structures would have to be removed from the land.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the final Unilateral Undertaking to tie the cabin/dwelling and land together in perpetuity being received within three months and subject to conditions relating to the retrospective nature of the permission, accordance with plans, including the Management Plan, occupation of the dwelling, annual monitoring report, construction method survey, light mitigation strategy, removal of permitted development rights, produce sold or bartered to be sourced from the land, ecological works, landscaping, planting and completion of the breeding farmland birds survey within 12 months.



- (b) REFERENCE: NP/19/0361/OUT
APPLICANT: Mr C Pratt
PROPOSAL: Outline application with all matters reserved for 102 affordable residential units, 8 shared ownership residential units and 34 open market residential units together with associated access, drainage & landscaping
LOCATION: Land at Brynhir, Tenby

Members were reminded that this application, which was classed as major development, was subject to a Committee site visit on 2nd September 2019. Originally scheduled to be brought to the postponed 18 March 2020 meeting, consideration of the application had been delayed due to the current Government advice during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Since that time, it was reported that the Inspector's final report on the revised Local Development Plan had been received by the Authority on 13 May 2020, and that this was a material consideration of significant weight. Although LDP1 remained the current adopted Local Development Plan until such time as LDP2 was formally adopted, the officers report had been amended to reflect the weight that LDP2 had in the decision making process.

In excess of 120 letters of objection had been received as well as a couple of letters offering comments on the application, and the key points raised had been summarised in the report.

The site lay partly within housing allocation HA377 as defined by the Local Development Plan 1. The allocation required a minimum level of 60% affordable housing on the site.

Many objections related to the loss of green/open space. However the application site was not identified as formal open space, although it had been used by residents as informal open space for some time. The site had been allocated for residential development for at least 2 local plan periods and it had therefore always been anticipated that the site would be developed for housing. Furthermore the application proposed a sufficient amount of open space, equipped play areas and a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA). A public access circular path would also be provided. Having regard to the above, the proposal was considered to effectively mitigate for any loss of informal open space.

The fact that the application site was Grade 3a agricultural land had also been raised by objectors, however the officer advised that size of the site was under the 20ha threshold which would have required it to be referred



to Welsh Government. The loss of the agricultural land was not considered so significant as to warrant refusal.

It was reported that LDP2 did not include an allocation for housing on the application site and as such the site was considered to be located within the countryside. However it was noted that the reason the site had not been allocated in LDP2 related to the failure of it coming forward for development and not because it was considered inappropriate for development. Officers considered, taking a balanced view, the development should be accepted in principle if considered solely against the policies in LDP2 due to the high proportion of affordable housing being delivered in an area where there was an identified need, which was a material consideration of sufficient weight to outweigh any departure from LDP2.

Notwithstanding the objections raised, following consideration of the policies contained within the current adopted Local Development Plan (LDP1), LDP2 Inspector's report, national planning policy and all material considerations, officers considered that on balance the proposal to provide a significant number of new affordable and open market residential properties, whilst sustaining the local character of the National Park and not adversely impacting on ecology or highway safety was acceptable, subject to S106 Agreements in respect of the provision of affordable units, open space/MUGA/play areas and a contribution towards libraries and a schedule of suitable conditions.

The officer noted that Tenby Civic Society had initially registered to speak at the meeting that day, but had since asked instead for their letter to be read out. This letter, together with a number of emails from other objectors, had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The first speaker was Jane Merrony. She advised that she was speaking on behalf of 1043 active Facebook members of the Tenby Greenspace Preservation Society. She expressed concern regarding the transparency and haste with which she felt the application was being progressed. She also questioned how the development would be funded in the current financial climate, particularly given the mitigations required by the site, and she feared that more housing would be requested on the site and that the development would become an ongoing building site with high congestion and inadequate infrastructure.

The availability of documents for comment by the public was also an area of concern, as there were now 66 reports for consideration, several of which, including the Landscape Impact Assessment, had only been placed on the website in recent weeks. This, she felt, introduced suspicion and deception.



Ms Merrony went on to note that there was no reference in the application to the 5 Ways of Working under the Future Generations Act by which both the NPA and County Council were bound, and she felt there had been inadequate consideration of how the development would comply with it or its impact on the wellbeing goals set out in the Public Service Board's Wellbeing Plan. There had also been no community involvement, neither had there been consideration of longer term environmental issues facing future generations. The report had not addressed the exceptional circumstances that would allow such a major development, and the need to use Grade 3 agricultural land had not been proven. She stated that illegality in decision making, irrationality and procedural unfairness called into questions the actions of the public bodies involved. Ms Merrony referred to separate correspondence which expressed concern regarding other aspects of the development and procedural matters such as the accuracy of the report content and the large number of reserved matters that were unresolved. She also referred to the fact that the land had not been included in LDP2 by the Inspector despite representations by PCC, and that the Inspector had been content that there would be a suitable supply of affordable housing in Tenby until 2031.

Finally she noted that in the midst of a global pandemic, the site and the community space it offered had been a godsend. Fearing that such events would only increase unless society's relationship with the environment was addressed, she noted the beneficial impact on physical and mental wellbeing of getting back to nature. She urged the Committee to preserve Brynhir as greenspace, noting that the community would propose an alternative use for it that was in line with current policy. She concluded by saying that the application should be refused so that the strategy of LDP2 would not be undermined and the plan subject to challenge.

Liam Hopkins, the agent, then addressed the Committee. Turning first to the status of the site in planning policy, he noted that the site had been allocated in LDP1 and that the application accorded with the requirements of the allocation. While he acknowledged it was not allocated in LDP2, this was not due to the inappropriateness of the land, but with the intention of providing an impetus to development. The Inspector's report noted that the National Park would not meet its need for affordable housing and had recommended a policy to support the delivery of schemes on public land. This was one such scheme, and the applicants were committed to addressing the need for affordable housing – the scheme had been included in the Council's revenue budget and a local lettings policy would be introduced for the site. Thus, he believed that the application accorded with LDP2, the conclusion also drawn in the officer's report.



Mr Hopkins went on to say that there was no ecological designation on the site and no adverse impacts identified in any of the reports. The environmental impacts of the application were understood and would be mitigated, including those on the landscape through the inclusion of additional planting. Significant trees had been identified and this had informed the alignment of the access. While the site may be visible from different viewpoints, it would appear as a minor extension to the edge of the town. The application was in accordance with the special qualities of the National Park. There was no flood risk and appropriate foul and surface water drainage would be provided. Public access to the site would be retained through a footpath around the perimeter of the site. He concluded by saying that the development accorded with both LDP1 and LDP2 and would address the town's housing need, particularly for affordable housing. He asked the Committee to grant approval.

Members asked a number of questions, regarding the status of the site's open space, confidence of its deliverability, and particularly delivery of such a high percentage of affordable housing, the Inspector's reference to targets for affordable housing being met on other sites in Tenby, the reference by the objector to "deception" and consideration of the visibility of the site in the landscape.

The officer replied that while the site had been used informally as open space, it had no legal status as such. While layout and design of the dwellings were reserved matters, officers would work with the architects to minimise the visual impact of the site. Turning to the deliverability of the site, officers had had pre-application discussions regarding the reserved matters application for the site and understood that a project officer had been appointed to take this, and other sites, forward. The proportion of affordable housing would form part of the legal agreement, and any change to this would come back before the Committee. The officer confirmed that the Inspector's Report stated that Tenby's affordable housing need could be provided for on other sites and through conversions, over the plan period. Finally with regard to the reference to "deception", the officer believed that the objector was referring to the fact that a number of the reports did not become available until the end of 2019, but this did not mean that the application could not be validated. Once they were available, she stated that commentators were notified and site and press notices were placed; they therefore had had the opportunity to comment.

Despite the officer's reassurance, some Members remained concerned about the potential visual impact of the site, run-off and the lack of a sustainable drainage scheme, inadequate landscaping and the access to the site from the main road. Also the pressure that would be put on local



facilities such as schools and healthcare. A request was made for photo montages to be made available as part of any reserved matters application to allow the site to be seen within the landscape. One member expressed the view that the proposal would be contrary to the Sandford Principle.

The officer confirmed that any reserved matters application would come before the Committee for consideration. She also confirmed that adequate consultation had taken place, with notification to neighbouring properties and those who had previously expressed an interest in the application as well as site notices and notices in the newspaper.

The Solicitor queried whether in light of references to the Well Being and Future Generations Act 2015 by Ms Merrony whether the officers believed that the development represented sustainable development and whether the statutory consultation processes adopted accorded with the five ways of working advocated by the Act. Officers confirmed their view that the development was sustainable and that the statutory processes were in accordance with the Act.

The recommendation to delegate approval of the application was moved and seconded. Considering the list of conditions, one Member asked whether public access to the area of woodland, improvements to footpaths in the area and the possibility of some plots being available for self-build could be raised in ongoing discussions with the applicant.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to grant planning permission subject to completion, within three months, of a S106 Agreement in respect of provision of affordable and shared ownership housing, management scheme for the open space and play areas and a contribution towards libraries. The application would also be subject to conditions in respect of timing of the reserved matters application(s) and of the development, accordance with plans, reserved matters, archaeological investigation, drainage scheme, site investigations, contamination, management of any gases, hours of working, samples of materials, removal of permitted development rights, undergrounding of cables, access, parking and turning, links to existing footpaths, landscape and ecological management plan, construction environmental management plan, construction management plan and lighting.

[The Committee adjourned for 10 minutes]



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/19/0657/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr A Muskett
PROPOSAL: Upgrading of existing car parking facility and interpretation boards, cladding of toilets and shelter canopy
LOCATION: Broad Haven Car Park, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest

This application was before the Committee as it was being made on behalf of the National Park Authority and was considered to be a major development. It had originally been scheduled to be brought to the postponed 18 March 2020, however its consideration had been delayed due to the current Government advice during the Covid-19 pandemic.

It was also reported that the Inspector's final report on the revised Local Development Plan had been received by the Authority on 13 May 2020, and that this was a material consideration of significant weight. However it was noted that it did not alter the policy context for this application.

Planning permission was sought for the resurfacing and reconfiguration of the car park, with rearrangement of parking bays, implementation of a landscaping scheme and native planting throughout the site, electric vehicle charging points and disabled parking spaces, new signboard structures, betterment of the existing public conveniences and pumping station building, site drainage improvements and introduction of new children's play and picnic areas which would enhance the area, which was regarded as a 'gateway' place for visitors to the National Park.

It was reported that one public response had been received which supported the project's objectives, but expressed concerns regarding some of the details. These, together with the officer's response, were set out in the report.

Officers considered that the proposed scheme, by virtue of its use, design, materials, landscaping and ecological mitigation and enhancement would provide a positive development within a rural centre which enhanced the visual quality of this area of the National Park. The development would enhance an important existing community facility and provide suitable development in terms of highway and traffic safety. The development was not considered to cause any additional adverse impact on the amenity or privacy of neighbouring properties. Potential adverse impact on ecology, habitats and landscape features both on and surrounding the site had been suitably mitigated against. Native planting and use of natural materials would enhance the landscape value of the site and drainage and flooding concerns had been suitably addressed. The recommendation was therefore one of approval, subject to conditions.



The first speaker on this application was Madeleine Capel who explained that in principle, she and her husband who lived adjacent to the site, were supportive of the scheme. However she believed there was some inaccuracy in the report before the Committee and she asked for additional conditions to be included as part of any grant of planning permission.

Mrs Capel believed that the incidence of flooding on the site was much higher than stated, greater than 1 in 100 years, and therefore the risk to the play area was much higher. Increased volumes of water in Haroldston Brook regularly flooded the fenland and the greensward. She was also aware of two larger flooding incidents in the last 10 years, the last time being in 2018, when the road and the area as far as the children's play area were flooded. She therefore suggested that the play area be relocated to the edge of the car park; this would also prevent families stopping in an area that was sensitive to wildlife. Mrs Capel was also concerned that the fence designed to stop children and dogs gaining entry to the river would catch bats flying down Haroldston Valley and prevent other wildlife accessing the river; she asked that it be omitted from the scheme. Finally she asked that the whole of the toilet block be clad, including the southern elevation.

The agent, Jonathan Pickford, then addressed the Committee, providing an overview of the project. He explained that he had been approached to help redesign the car park to create a more user friendly environment. Surface water runoff would be alleviated through installation of permeable gravel parking areas and the area would be made safer through the introduction of pedestrian footpaths and crossing points. Fast electric charging points would be introduced and Welsh Government funding would allow for enhancements to the toilet block that was owned by Pembrokeshire County Council. Removal of part of the stone wall at the crossing point to the beach would increase visibility for and of pedestrians. The car park would also benefit from interpretation sign boards, bench seating, picnic tables, bike racks and a play area. The proposals had been presented to the community and amendments made to the scheme as a result of their feedback.

Turning to the concerns raised regarding flooding, the agent noted that surface water runoff would be reduced and a drainage swale had been added. The play area itself was not in the flood zone and would in any case be used by children accompanied by their parents; any danger of flooding would be evident.

Members asked a number of questions, including why a play area had been included within the scheme, as this would have maintenance and



insurance liabilities, and regarding lighting and the inclusion of the fence. The applicant was also present and he replied that rather than a play area of swings, slides, etc, the area would be more of a play space, containing a series of low-key logs for children to climb on. No additional lighting was proposed. The officer replied that the fence had been included as a recommendation from an otter survey that had been undertaken. Natural Resources Wales had been consulted and had raised no objection.

Members felt this to be an excellent scheme, but agreed that the whole of the toilet block should be clad, and the applicant advised that this element of the scheme was subject to approval from Pembrokeshire County Council and would depend on the future of the building. There was also some concern that, as storminess was increasing, the play area would be located in an area that might be subject to erosion and other problems in future.

That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of development, accordance with plans (subject to an amended drawing being submitted to include cladding to all sides of the public conveniences), Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and Otter & Badger Survey Report, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement, sensitive clearance strategy, Construction Environmental Management Plan, scheme for protection of the fen area, replacement of any approved planting which dies or is damaged, scheme to eradicate and prevent the spread of invasive species, details of any external illumination, protection of watercourse and surface water drainage.

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/19/0665/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr J & Mrs C Evans
PROPOSAL: Change of use of Linked Granny Annexe to Holiday Let
LOCATION: Red Houses, The Rhos, Haverfordwest

Members were reminded that this application had been considered by the Committee at its January meeting, when Members were minded to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendation. As a result the Authority's 'cooling-off' procedure had been applied. It had originally been scheduled to be brought back to the postponed 18 March 2020 meeting, however its consideration had been delayed due to the current Government advice during the Covid-19 pandemic.

It was also reported that the Inspector's final report on the revised Local Development Plan (LDP2) had been received by the Authority on 13 May 2020, and that this was a material consideration of significant weight.



An extension to the property for use as a granny annex had been permitted under NP/13/0309/FUL. Conditions had been attached to the permission to ensure that it remained ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling and that it should not be used for any commercial use. Routine monitoring on holiday letting properties had shown that the annex had been advertised for letting since 2018.

The site was outside of any of the Centres designated in Local Development Plan (LDP) 1 and therefore in the countryside. The LDP1 allowed for appropriate buildings in the countryside to be converted to a range of uses including holiday letting. When considering such proposals, accessibility to Centres was an important consideration. In this instance the site was located over a kilometre from any Centre and there was no public transport in the area. The Supplementary Planning Guidance did list exceptions where development proposals were permissible, however this proposal did not comply with any of these requirements.

However it was reported that in LDP2, there was no reference within Policy 7 to the Accessibility SPG, and the requirement for conversions to be considered 'accessible' had dropped away. Given that this was the sole reason for refusal, and this followed National Planning Policy, this was considered to be a sufficiently significant material consideration to warrant a changed recommendation on this aspect.

The report went on to state that the site was in an isolated location, and it was not expected that the activity associated with a holiday let would have any detrimental effect on neighbouring amenity as long as it remained in the control of the applicants. It was therefore necessary to ensure that the two buildings were tied together in perpetuity through a S106 Agreement to protect the amenity of the occupiers of the attached dwelling.

Officers therefore concluded that although when first considered by the Authority, this application had been contrary to the adopted LDP1, LDP2 as recommended in the Inspector's Report was a significant material consideration. In this document, the need to consider the accessibility of this proposed holiday let to centres was not included, and the application could be supported, subject to the submission of a legal agreement and to conditions as set out in the report.

At the meeting, the officer apologised for an error on page 104 of her report which stated that a financial contribution in respect of affordable housing would be required; this was a misinterpretation of the policy.

Members were pleased with the removal of the accessibility requirement from Policy 7 of LDP2 though the Inspector's Report, and that this this



had allowed officers to change the recommendation to one of delegated approval. They also hoped that this provision of holiday accommodation would boost the local economy as the county looked to recover from the pandemic lockdown, and were pleased that the accommodation provided was accessible to disabled people, as there was a shortage of such facilities.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer advised that as the application had been brought back to the Committee following a 'cooling off' period, there should be a recorded vote. On the proposition that the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the submission of a legal agreement within 3 months to tie the ownership of the two dwellings and subject to conditions as set out in the report, the votes were as follows:

For: Councillor P Baker, Councillor D Clements, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor M Evans, Councillor P Harries, Dr M Havard, Mrs S Hoss, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Mr G Jones, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor P Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Dr R Plummer, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland.

Against: None

Abstentions: None

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to the submission of a legal agreement within 3 months to tie the ownership of the two dwellings and subject to conditions in respect of use as holiday accommodation only, access, parking and turning and submission of a scheme for appropriate biodiversity enhancement.

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/20/0222/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr T Brinicombe
PROPOSAL: Installation of underground electricity cables (including below ground jointing bays and one above ground link pillar) and underground fibre optic cables; temporary construction compound and construction haul roads.
LOCATION: Linear site extending from the intertidal sand flats at Freshwater West to Neath Farm, Rhoscrowther, Pembroke

It was reported that this project proposed a subsea and underground electricity interconnector linking the power markets in Ireland and Great Britain. Greenlink would provide a new grid connection between EirGrid's Great Island substation in County Wexford (Ireland) and National Grid's



Pembroke substation. The power would be able to flow in either direction, depending on supply and demand in each country.

Brief details of the application were set out in the report. As it was a development requiring Environmental Impact Assessment, was classed as a major development and was of public interest, Members were asked to consider a Committee Site Visit to review the site and its surroundings, prior to consideration of the planning application at a subsequent meeting. However given the current situation with Covid-19, it was proposed that the site visit would be undertaken using video conferencing facilities to provide Members with a virtual site visit experience.

Members agreed to a site visit, noting that if it was not possible to visit the site in person, a virtual site visit would be helpful. The Director of Planning and Park Direction advised that at present a site visit was not permitted, however if it became possible for Members to visit the site, either individually or as a group, then this could be arranged in addition to the virtual site visit.

One Member asked if the applicant could provide a drone flyover of the site and the officer agreed to request this.

DECISION: That the Committee undertake a virtual site inspection of the site.

[Councillor M Evans was not present for the following item.]

7. Appeals

The Director of Planning and Park Direction reported on 1 appeal (against planning decisions made by the Authority) in respect of a material change of use of land to booking office & overnight camping at Abereddy Beach, Abereddy. It was reported that the appeal had been dismissed and the enforcement notice upheld. A copy of the Inspector's decision was attached to the report for Members' information. Officers advised that they would continue to monitor the site.

NOTED.

The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 15 July 2020 without amendment.

