

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

27 January 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

[Virtual Meeting, 10.00am – 1.10pm; 1.20pm – 2.40pm]

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
<i>Minutes 6(a)below</i> NP/20/0437/FUL Retrospective planning application for doorway on West elevation and proposed skylights, Apple Tree Gallery, The Ridgeway, Saundersfoot	Councillor P Baker	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting thereon
<i>Minutes 6(d)below</i> NP/20/0407/FUL 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.	Councillor P Baker Councillor M Evans Mrs J James	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting thereon



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 - Coed-derw, St. Brides Hill, Saundersfoot

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 9 December 2020 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 9 December 2020 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 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/20/0437/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Retrospective planning application for doorway on West elevation and proposed skylights – Apple Tree Gallery, The Ridgeway, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9JE	Mr Hussain – Solicitor on behalf of objectors Mrs Mannings – Applicant
NP//20/0233/FUL <i>Minute 6(b) refers</i>	Partially retrospective application for dual- pitch-roofed outbuilding with natural slate roof, rendered walls and patio doors and circular window, with natural slate roof – The Wigwam, Freshwater East, Pembroke, SA71 5LF	Paul Royston – Applicant



NP/20/0291/FUL <i>Minute 6(c)</i> <i>refers</i>	Regularisation of existing use of Abereiddy Common Car Park as a car park (limited to 6 disabled person parking spaces) with drop off and turning area with the change of use of part of agricultural field at grid reference 179962 230984 to use as a car park with siting of car park attendants hut – Abereiddi Beach Car Park, Llanrhian	Shelagh McKibbin – Objector Cllr Neil Prior – Local Councillor Fintan Godkin – Applicant
NP/20/0407/FUL <i>Minute 6(d)</i> <i>refers</i>	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 – Coed- Derw, St Brides Hill, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire SA69 9NP	Sean Hannaby & Andrew Evans – Agent/Applicant
NP/20/0507/PNA <i>Minute 6(f)</i> <i>Refers</i>	Polytunnel & Solar Panels – Land at Penrallt, Velindre, Crymych, SA41 3XW	Jonathan Tiller - Applicant

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.

The Solicitor added that in respect of one of the applications before the Committee that day there was a dispute regarding access rights which the Authority did not consider to be a material consideration, although correspondence on behalf of the objectors suggested otherwise.

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*):

[With the agreement of the meeting, the Chair took the following item out of order of the agenda.]

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/20/0437/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs D & Y Mannings
PROPOSAL: Retrospective planning application for doorway on West elevation and proposed skylights
LOCATION: Apple Tree Gallery, The Ridgeway, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9JE

Members were reminded that this application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the Committee to allow circulation and proper consideration of additional information provided by the applicant. A previous application (NP/20/0279/FUL) had been made for alterations, extensions and change of use of the gallery, and this had been refused planning permission at the meeting of the Committee on 2 September 2020. The current application did not seek permission to change the use of the gallery or for extension, but for a reduced set of alterations only.

The building's position was prominent within the street scene and made a positive contribution to the character of the area. Officers considered that the introduction of new openings into the western elevation did not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the building, and its form and appearance would be largely retained following the development. It was also noted that the Building Conservation Officer had advised that the rooflights were acceptable in light of the clear determination by the Inspector in dismissing the appeal for non-



determination of the previous application, that the new rooflights would preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.

Saundersfoot Community Council had objected to the application and a number of third party representations had also been received as set out in the report. Since writing the report other representations had been received and some of these had been circulated to Members on request. One of the main areas of concern was the use of the lane adjoining the site and the safety of the door. However the Highway Authority had offered no objection to the creation of the doorway or its positioning on highway safety grounds, and their recommendation remained unchanged after considering the recent correspondence. The issues of access to the lane were a civil matter between the parties involved and were not material to this application.

Notwithstanding the objections raised, it was noted that the application was to regularise the insertion of a door and allow for the insertion of three additional openings into an existing building. The alterations were considered to have an acceptable impact on the character of the building and preserve or enhance the character of this part of the Saundersfoot Conservation Area. They were not considered to impact unacceptably on residential amenity or the local environment and were considered to be in accordance with LDP2. The recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

Mr Hussain, a Solicitor acting on behalf of objectors to the application (he clarified that he was representing most of the residents of Back Lane) then addressed the Committee. He explained that he had asked for his detailed representations to be circulated and would not repeat the points contained therein, however he believed that it was important to consider all development at the site as he believed that the applicant was seeking to obtain permission for the different elements by stealth, some through the current application and others via a future application. He did not believe that the changes being proposed reflected the stated aim of increasing footfall to the gallery.

Turning to the doorway, he re-stated that there was no right of way or established easement along the access road and because of this misunderstanding, he did not believe that the Highway Authority had completed its assessment correctly and a footpath/barrier should be provided (in accordance with S66 of the Highway Act). A footpath already existed along the north elevation where a doorway had been blocked up and he felt that this should be reinstated. He went on to talk about the need for an Equalities Impact Assessment which would require the door to be suitable for wheelchair users. He suggested that the Committee had



a responsibility to consider pedestrian safety even if this was a civil matter.

Mr Hussain questioned why the additional window was needed in the west elevation and suggested that a window on the southern elevation that currently provided light to that area would be blocked up in future if the use of the building changed to residential. He stated that a Building Regulations application for such a conversion was currently being considered by the relevant authority.

Reference was then made to policies 59 and 60 of LDP2 which related to sustainable transport and proper access, noting that there would be congestion and parking outside the property would be unsafe. He maintained that emergency vehicles couldn't access the lane with a vehicle parked outside the gallery and this had happened on two separate occasions.

In terms of amenity, while there may not be any impact on the quality of the environment, the application had caused significant conflict in the area and the Authority had a duty to foster the social wellbeing of its communities.

In response to Mr Hussain's presentation Members noted that they could only consider the application before them that day, not what could be submitted in the future. They also asked officers about the Building Regulations application, however they replied that they were not aware of the detail of the application. The Solicitor added that the existence of any Building Regulations approval did not mean that planning permission had or should be granted.

In response to some of the points made by Mr Hussain, the Solicitor, Mr Felgate, noted that trespass was a civil matter and it was for the objectors to enforce their rights through the courts. He emphasised that members should not seek to make a determination on whether there were access rights or not, which was clearly a complex matter in respect of which there was dispute. He explained that he had provided detailed advice to officers regarding the civil matters which confirmed his views.

In respect of the reference to S66 of the Highway Act, he noted that the Highway Authority had a duty to provide a footpath only if they believed it fulfilled various criteria, which they did not. The duty was qualified and did not mandate provision of a footpath at this location.

He believed there were three matters that Members should consider to be potentially material –



- highway/pedestrian safety, in respect of which the Authority should defer to the advice of the Highway Authority;
- the appropriateness of wheelchair access through the new doorway; in respect of which it was relevant that there was an alternative access and in respect of which Building Regulations had to be complied with, which would focus on the appropriate levels and interior layout of the building. The issue of external wheelchair movements in the lane was tied up with highway/pedestrian safety which the Highway Authority had considered;
- the amenity impacts on neighbouring property which the officer had dealt with in his report and concluded were not sufficient to justify refusal.

The Solicitor went on to clarify that there was a veiled threat of proceedings against the Authority in the correspondence received, which was a reference to Judicial Review. He had considered that and explained that if he was of the view there was a risk of a successful Judicial Review he would advise the Committee of that. He explained that members should also consider that there were risks of appeal by the applicant and potential costs consequences if they unreasonably refused permission and that simply accepting Mr Hussain's submissions at face value was not without risk.

Finally he added that while reference had been made to the Authority having a duty to foster the wellbeing of the community, it was important to understand and not to overstate the extent of any such duty. He thought this was a reference to one of the well being goals in the Well Being of Future Generations Act 2015 and the duty was to achieve sustainable development by achieving a variety of well being goals.

The second speaker was Mrs Mannings, the applicant. She asked the Committee to support the application because of the gallery's use as a tourist attraction for visitors to Saundersfoot, a role it had fulfilled for 23 years. She believed that the application was in full compliance with the development plan and the intentions of the National Park. She stated that a gallery needed a clearly visible entrance, however before the door was moved from the north to the west elevation, people would be less likely to enter the building as the door in the north was not visible when you approached the building on foot whereas the new door was. Additionally, closing the north entrance had created an unbroken interior wall on which to hang paintings. Mrs Mannings contended that the new door was not dangerous, nor did it affect traffic, but it did improve footfall to the gallery and was therefore an improvement. She concluded that the gallery was now a presentable, attractive building and she asked the Committee to support the application as a public amenity.



In response to a question regarding approximate daily footfall to the gallery during high season, Mrs Mannings replied that this was difficult to answer as it varied widely. Many visitors would visit when passing the building at the end of a day on the beach and would therefore arrive through the east entrance. Other visitors were a result of the classes that were run in the building and many of these returned on a regular basis. She believed that to have a west entrance would increase footfall fivefold. She clarified that most visitors came on foot, with only those collecting a picture parking briefly outside. Parking in front of the door would not be encouraged as this would make it less visible. When asked why the door had been moved before planning permission had been obtained, Mrs Mannings replied that previously the building had had planning permission for a door on the west elevation, so they believed it would be acceptable now. Consultation with the National Park had taken place, with two ladies having approved of their ideas, and they hadn't realised they needed to do anything more as the doorway was on their own property. She confirmed that they intended to retain doors in both the east and west elevations.

Some Members expressed some sympathy with the points raised by objectors, however 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 approved plans and documents, protection of any bats encountered, doors and windows to open inwards with no steps or ramps, approval of the type and fitting of roof lights and the new window to match existing.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/20/0233/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr P Royston
PROPOSAL: Partially retrospective application for dual- pitch- roofed outbuilding with natural slate roof, rendered walls and patio doors and circular window, with natural slate roof
LOCATION: The Wigwam, Freshwater East, Pembroke, Pembrokeshire, SA71 5LF

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the views of Lamphey Community Council, and the Chair had requested its consideration through the extended delegation scheme.

It was reported that planning permission had been granted in 2018 for external alterations to the property and construction of a single storey



mono pitch double garage. However no garage door had ever been inserted in the structure and this application was to regularise the amended development.

Officers considered that the principle of development at this site was acceptable and would have no harm on visual amenity, the character and appearance of the proposed host building or wider amenity. The development had a scale, form, mass and detailed design which was in keeping with the area. The Highway Authority had raised no objection to the development, and the Pembrokeshire County Council Drainage Engineers had supported the application subject to conditions. Conditions could also be included in respect of landscaping and biodiversity.

Officers had considered the views raised by the Community Council and did not believe that these raised significant material considerations which would outweigh the support set out in the report. Therefore in conclusion, following consideration of local and national policy and having regard to all material considerations, it was considered that the development provided modern living accommodation with a sustainable design and was in keeping with the aims of LDP2 in that the development would conserve and enhance the existing character of the site and special qualities of this area of the National Park. As such, and subject to a schedule of suitable conditions, the recommendation was one of approval.

Mr Royston, the applicant then addressed the Committee. He explained that the house was his primary residence and it had been extensively improved in recent years through refurbishment and construction of the outbuilding. He explained that he had submitted a number of variations to the original plans, however it had always been intended to use this building for storage, of for example books and CDs, and as a space to enjoy them. He noted that the driveway would hold eight cars, and as a garage door was expensive and would not be used, he had decided not to put in a door. He explained that other houses nearby used their garages in a similar manner, with some having a false door and others no door at all.

Members clarified that the room would be used for the applicant's private purposes and then moved and seconded the recommendation of approval.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the application, accordance with plans and documents, landscaping scheme, sustainable drainage, biodiversity enhancement scheme and lighting.



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/20/0291/FUL
APPLICANT: Man Up UK Activities Ltd
PROPOSAL: Regularisation of existing use of Abereidly Common Car Park as a car park (limited to 6 disabled person parking spaces) with drop off and turning area with the change of use of part of agricultural field at grid reference 179962 230984 to use as a car park with siting of car park attendants hut.
LOCATION: Abereidly Beach Car Park and part of field (at grid ref 179987 230990), Llanrhian, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 5BQ

It was reported that the beach frontage at Abereidly had been used as a car park for several decades, however it had never been granted planning permission for this use. Given the amount of time the area had been used for car parking, the use would be considered lawful with the appropriate evidence. The existing beach car parking area was eroding and a significant area had been lost to the sea in the last few years, reducing the amount of car parking available, leading to pressures on the environment and community.

Following the severe storms in 2014, the Authority had begun discussing potential alternative car parking areas to secure access to Abereidly for the future, and the application site was identified as a suitable location for a displacement car park. In recent years, the proposed car park had been operating under 28 day permitted development rights, along with the beach car park.

Historically water activity providers had used parking spaces on the beach to meet clients to take on water activity excursions. A booking office and kit hire facility had previously been set up without the benefit of planning permission. Enforcement notices were served requiring the cessation of the use as a booking office. The notice was upheld at appeal and the unauthorised use had ceased on site. However officers considered that provided the area was used as a meeting location for customers only, the presence of the water activity providers was not considered to be development.

A strong objection had been received regarding the need for additional parking for local people at the beach car park, particularly in the evenings and out of season. The applicant had not amended the plan from 6 disabled spaces, but had indicated that the area designated for commercial activity providers would be available at these times and the Authority had no objection to this approach.



Officers considered that the proposal represented a sustainable long-term solution to the issues faced at Abereddy beach in regard to continued access. Whilst it was noted that the top car park would have an adverse impact on the landscape, the harm would be displaced from the impact currently experienced at the beach car park. Additional hedgebanks were also proposed. The proposal was considered acceptable in terms of highway and pedestrian safety, and the proposal to run a shuttle bus from the top car park to the beach as set out in the management plan would provide an improvement over the current situation. However in order to ensure that the development provided the most appropriate solution to the needs of local people while not having an adverse impact on safety or the special qualities of the National Park, it was proposed that the permission be granted subject to a condition requiring the review of the management plan after a period of 12 months from implementation.

On balance, the proposed development was considered to comply with national and local planning policies and could be supported subject to conditions.

At the meeting, the Director of Planning and Park Direction reported that a number of representations had been received since writing the Committee report, and in discussion with the Authority's legal advisors it was now proposed to amend condition 1 to include a complete date on the management plan; condition 3 to add that if no subsequent management plan was submitted, the existing management plan would remain in force; condition 4 to add that permitted development rights for 28 day use of the site to be removed; and to tighten the wording of condition 5 to refer to 6 disabled spaces and other use of the beach car park by local resident permit holders and water sports providers only.

Members sought clarification regarding signage, the frequency of the shuttle bus, and a number of the conditions, and the officer advised that the Authority would be able to input into the amount and type of signage which would be licensed by the Highway Authority. The shuttle bus had been offered by the applicant and was not a requirement of the Highway Authority and would be provided on an as needs basis. It was suggested that the provision would be part of the review of the management plan in twelve months' time. The officer also agreed to look again at the detailed wording of some of the conditions in light of the suggestions made by Members.

The first of three speakers was Shelagh McKibbin (Parker). She explained that she was the co-owner of a cottage at Abereddy and had been visiting annually for the last 50 years. The cottage was also used as a furnished holiday let. She stated that there had been an ongoing history of problems relating to parking and coastering at Abereddy with the



issues getting worse each year, particularly since what she called Man-up's aggressive commercialisation of the activity. Working with local residents, she had suggested some amendments to the conditions set out in the report and was pleased and thankful that some of these had been taken on board. She believed that these would ensure what was intended by the application – a cessation of parking at the beach other than that expressly permitted. This would stop the car park creeping on to the common land at the rear of the site and the verges of the public footpath. With regard to the parking location of the activity providers, she believed that this should be to the southern end of the beach, however the management plan was lacking in detail on this, and other points and Mrs McKibbin believed that this needed to be amplified if the conditions were to work. She also believed that there needed to be an additional conditions - to prevent overnight camping/parking, and while she acknowledged that this was a big issue across the whole county, she felt that the landowner should be encouraged to take more effective security measures; to guarantee free parking for local residents in perpetuity; to prohibit coaches, caravans and commercial operators; also a stronger condition regarding appropriate screening in the top car park.

Mrs McKibbin also felt sustainability of the shuttle service needed to be guaranteed by asking for a bond, and that for highway safety reasons it needed to remain free of charge. She stated that it was the expectation of the local community that the permission should be implemented in full during the coming year, and therefore development should take place within 2, not 5 years.

Members sought clarification regarding the problem of overnight parking and were advised that 20 vehicles had been counted there, with associated noise late at night and early in the morning, together with refuse.

The second speaker was Councillor Neil Prior who was County Councillor for the Llanrhian ward, and who explained that this issue was of great concern locally, particularly as local voices did not feel listened to. The concern of the community was outlined in the report, however there was particular concern over free parking for locals, who feel that it's 'their' beach. Other concerns related to the visual impact, road safety and overnight parking. However he believed that the situation was improving as the applicant and landowner became willing to work more closely with the community – confidence and trust between the applicants and other stakeholders would be critical going forward and the conditions attached to any permission were key to this. Everyone agreed that a long term solution was needed to this problem due to increasing demand and a receding shoreline and the community was happy to support this application in principle. However the applicants also needed to act in



accordance with their words and to work with local stakeholders. He hoped that there would be continued dialogue to achieve a solution, but this needed to be backed up with appropriate conditions. He also hoped that the proposals could be progressed as soon as possible.

Councillor Prior also clarified for the Committee that he welcomed the strengthened conditions, however he acknowledged that a balance had to be struck to allow this opportunity to succeed. He also remained concerned at the highway situation as he believed there was still a safety element to be considered in that revetments were required to protect both the cottages and the road as the latter was very close to the cliff edge and there had been some landslips and subsidence; he did not believe it would take much for a pedestrian to slip.

The final speaker was Fintan Godkin, the applicant. He said that he appreciated that the application had raised a lot of interest locally and thanked all parties for their patience. He explained that he had become involved as an activity provider in 2016/17 and had seen the need for management of the car park. Access also needed to be maintained for emergency services. The popularity of Aberiddi had increased due to national and international exposure, however the increased footfall provided an important source of income for local businesses both on and off the site, and a practical solution to provide a fit for purpose car park had to be found. To this end, relocation away from the sea was the only viable option. He stated that he was prepared to work with the Council and the community to ensure practical operation of the new arrangements were reviewed and made to work. As a business he employed local staff, many of whom were under 25 and these year round positions supported government pathways for careers.

In response to some of the pictures which had been circulated, he pointed out that parking on the grass had been a problem since 2014, prior to their arrival on site. He acknowledged that encroachment had increased and welcomed a physical boundary to prevent this. With regard to the park and ride, he clarified that this would be available all the time the car park was open and staffed, between April and September. He believed that most people would be happy to walk up and down the road, however he had offered the service to help the elderly, those with young families and with mobility issues. Disabled parking would be provided in the beach car park and he stated that someone would be stationed there to ensure that it remained free from unwanted traffic. With regard to parking for local people, passes had been issued to those who lived in the Llanrhian ward since parking charges had been introduced in 2018 and there was no admin charge. There was no intention to change this, with the landowner adamant that it was to continue.



Members asked how realistic the figure of 190 vehicle spaces was, and Mr Godkin replied that this was based on ticket sales over the last 2-3 years and believed that it would be more than sufficient for all but 3-5 days per year, bank holidays when queues were likely at any of the county's beaches and beauty spots. It was confirmed that the top car park would be open all year round, albeit with more restricted hours out of season. However the aim of the proposal was to manage the traffic during the peak season. Members also noted the importance of communicating the new arrangements to visitors and the role of signage in this respect; Mr Godkin noted that as the upper car park had been in use during the last two seasons, some visitors would already be familiar with the arrangements.

Members also asked about the Community Council's request for an increase from 6 to 12 parking spaces at the beach car park. Mr Godkin replied that while he was happy to submit another planning application for this, he noted that out of season the commercial area would be available for local people to park in. The Director of Planning and Park Direction added that any application to increase the number of spaces, if there was evidence that 6 was not sufficient, would be considered, however the Authority would not support two car parks at Abereididi.

Turning to the problem of overnight parking, Mr Godkin hoped that the positioning of boulders, and marking the spaces for disabled users would prevent mass parking. He confirmed that the upper car park would be locked at night. The Director added that enforcement action could be taken at the bottom car park if necessary, however no prosecution had been progressed to date as the landowners were not encouraging the problem.

Members were pleased to see all parties working together to achieve a solution to the problem, and the recommendation of approval, with the amended conditions set out by the Director, was moved and seconded. However some concerns remained regarding the lack of detail in the management plan, particularly with regard to operation of the shuttle bus. While some felt that more information could be included following a twelve month review of the operation, one Member felt that it should be provided prior to the operation commencing to provide greater clarity. The Director suggested that an additional condition could be included to require details of the shuttle to be submitted to and agreed by the Authority. Due to the concerns expressed, the Solicitor suggested that the conditions to be attached to the application be delegated to the Director who could take account of Members' concerns. The proposer and seconder agreed to amend their motion in this regard.



DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions which were delegated to the Director of Planning and Park Direction.

[Councillor P Baker tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture.]

[The meeting was adjourned between 1.10pm and 1.20pm]

- (d) 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

It was reported that this application was before the Committee at the request of a Member.

The site comprised a large residential property which had been converted in the past to provide some holiday accommodation which included rear extensions to provide additional accommodation and fire exits. The property did not appear to have had formal consent for any use beyond a residential dwelling with B&B accommodation as ancillary to the use of the dwelling.

The proposed development would create 18 bed-sit flats for staff accommodation, and the proposal would require a Section 106 agreement to link the property to the St Brides Spa Hotel, as well as a condition to ensure that it was used only for the purpose intended. However the legal agreement had not been pursued at this time given the concerns raised by officers and the recommendation of refusal.

Officers considered that the principle of the proposals was acceptable, and would have no additional impact on the character of the building when viewed from the street scene. However it was considered that the proposed scale, form and overall mass of the new rear extension would result in an overbearing impact on the amenity of neighbours and constituted over development of the site. The proposed development would also result in an overshadowing impact to a neighbouring dwelling.



As such, the proposed development in its current form was contrary to several policies within LDP2 and the recommendation was one of refusal.

It was reported at the meeting that a further letter had been received from a neighbour and this had been circulated to the Committee. The applicant had also clarified that the term 'key worker' referred to hotel employees, who were essential for the running of the business and often found it difficult to find suitable accommodation. Additional landscaping had also been proposed to aid softening and the perceived impact on privacy. The officer clarified that the overshadowing was in relation to a rear kitchen window at 'Springfield', and noted that the Oriel bay windows were designed to prevent overlooking to dwellings to the rear.

The Chair welcomed Andrew Evans, the applicant, and his agent Sean Hannaby who would be sharing the 5 minutes speaking time between them. Mr Evans began by explaining that he co-owned the St Brides Spa Hotel with his wife. He described Saundersfoot as an exemplar coastal community that was open all year, and the St Brides contributed to that community through its supply chain and circular economy. He believed that quality, subsidised staff accommodation was the key to the success of his award winning hotel, and this need had been prioritised by lockdown and the need to ensure staff and resident safety. Due to difficulties with public transport routes and timings it was difficult for staff to travel and vacancies remained unfilled. The property the subject of the application was nearby and had been used as a bed and breakfast property. Following discussions with officers, the application had been reviewed and meetings held with neighbours resulting in a reduction in depth of the building and it being moved away from the boundary. The design was of a high standard and would provide quality accommodation. The side windows had been angled and louvered to prevent overlooking. There were no shared spaces within the property and senior staff would also be resident. He noted that most staff did not drive so there would be few car movements. The project would sustain and protect jobs for the future.

Mr Hannaby went on to state that no objections had been received from consultees, and one of the two objectors had now confirmed that their concerns had been allayed. He was concerned that the amended plans had not been included within the report, which also stated that the extension would extend 16.5 metres into the garden area when this had now been reduced to 15.9m. He noted that the use was considered acceptable, the design welcomed and the materials appropriate. The building could be tied to the St Brides Spa Hotel through a S106 Agreement and privacy issues had been addressed through the design and boundary treatment. Mr Hannaby also noted that the existing three storey rear extensions would be removed and the new extension would



be of a smaller footprint. While it marginally breached the 45 degree line for overshadowing, the sunpath diagram showed that overshadowing only affected a tree and part of the Springfield parking area during winter. The officer report acknowledged that this was small and a distance of 17m away. He did not believe that a 2 storey extension placed centrally, and further from the hedge and Springfield than the existing, would be overbearing and also found it difficult to understand how this would adversely affect the landscape of the National Park. He believed that this good quality extension would have a positive visual impact on the locality.

In response to a question, Mr Evans advised that the business employed 65 people year round, which increased by 20 in the peak season. Although they tried to recruit locally, some staff came from out of the county. He also confirmed that the building would be exclusively for staff accommodation and that he was happy to complete a S106 agreement.

Members were concerned at Mr Hannaby's comment that amended plans had been submitted but were not before the Committee. The officer confirmed that the amended plans had been submitted after the Committee report had been printed, however the amended plans had been included within the presentation. He also confirmed that Saundersfoot Community Council had objected to the development but had not had an opportunity to comment on the amended plans. He added that despite the amendments, officers still had concerns regarding the scale of the proposed rear extension and the extent of the fenestration.

The Solicitor noted that the Wheatcroft Principle allowed changes to be made at later stages of the planning process provided no-one was prejudiced by that. As the amendments related to increase landscaping and a reduced scheme, further consultation was not necessary according to the law.

The Committee agreed that principles of fairness were also relevant and it was proposed that the application be deferred to allow Saundersfoot Community Council to be consulted on the amended plans.

DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow relevant parties to be consulted on the amended plans.



- (e) REFERENCE: NP/20/0436/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr J Gowin
PROPOSAL: Proposed rear extension and front porch to the existing property. New double garage and summerhouse
LOCATION: Rhydyfferm, U3133 Junction C3019 Llangloffan To Junction U3129, Castle Morris, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 5UX

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the views of the Community Council, and the Chair had requested its consideration through the extended delegation scheme.

The existing dwelling was a single storey 'U-shaped' property outside of any settlement boundary and in the open countryside. The proposed extension was situated to the rear of the dwelling and was relatively small scale and considered acceptable in terms of its design. The proposed porch was small scale and although the timber finish was not in-keeping with the existing dwelling, it was not considered to adversely affect its character.

The proposed garage and summerhouse were to the south west of the dwelling and were significantly set back from the highway. The development would be situated adjacent to an existing tractor store and would be accessed from an existing gravel track, therefore it was considered that this was the most appropriate siting for the development. Although the building was quite large in scale and was relatively high, the hipped roof and 'L-shaped' building design reduced the overall bulk of the development.

Concerns had been raised by Pencaer Community Council regarding the size and placement of the building and whether this would make way for the building to be turned into a dwelling in future. Officers recognised this concern and therefore a condition was proposed to ensure that it remained ancillary to the existing dwelling.

It was therefore concluded that the proposed development was acceptable in terms of its scale, design, siting and materials which would not detrimentally affect the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings or the visual amenities of the National Park. The application was considered to be in accordance with the policies of LDP2 and the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

At the meeting, the officer referred to some late correspondence received from the applicant's agent regarding the existing access. In light of the information provided, the access was acceptable to the Highway



Authority. The recommendation remained one of approval with the deletion of condition 8 as set out in the report.

Members were reassured by officers that the condition requiring the garage/summerhouse to be used ancillary to the residential use of the property would be monitored and any change of use, for example to a holiday let, would require a separate planning application. The recommendation of approval was therefore moved and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, occupation to be ancillary to the main dwelling, accordance with bat survey and installation of bat/bird boxes, lighting, tree protection and archaeology.

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/20/0507/PNA
APPLICANT: Mr J Tiller
PROPOSAL: Polytunnel & Solar Panels
LOCATION: Land at Penrallt, Velindre, Crymych, Pembrokeshire, SA41 3XW

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the views of the Community Council, and the Chair had requested its consideration through the extended delegation scheme.

The application was for Prior Notification of a polytunnel and solar panels. Prior Notifications fell under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) - 'the GPDO' – which provided a general planning permission (known as 'permitted development rights') for certain types of minor development. Under this process, the Local Planning Authority were given 28 days to determine whether:

- Prior Approval was not required as there were no concerns over siting or appearance – development could proceed
- Prior Approval was required and further details had to be submitted
- Prior Approval was Refused on the basis of siting or appearance

In this instance, the Authority had already formed the view that while the development might benefit from permitted development rights under the GPDO 1995 Part 6 A 1 (a)-(i), prior approval was required.

Since initial receipt, the siting proposed by the applicants had been altered to follow the western boundary of the field and two smaller polytunnels were proposed to replace one larger one. It had further been



clarified that the solar panels were to power a bore-hole to ensure there was adequate water for the agro-forestry business being carried out on the site.

The site was located near to Nevern Castle, a Scheduled Ancient Monument, and Cadw had been consulted with regard to the potential for visual impact, however they had advised they had no objection.

Nevern Community Council had objected to the application, initially expressing concern over the lack of information, and then regarding its impact on the character of the surrounding landscape and in an historically important village. Their detailed concerns were set out and addressed in the report.

The officer recommended that prior approval should be granted subject to conditions.

The applicant, Mr Jonathan Tiller, then addressed the Committee. He explained that following the Community Council's initial objection he had contacted them, however although he had received an acknowledgement he had received no further contact. However he was disappointed that they had again objected with a different set of concerns. He had consulted neighbouring landowners who were both supportive. He therefore hoped that the Committee would support the application.

In response to a question from Members, Mr Tiller explained that he intended to use the polytunnels to propagate trees for agroforestry, a sustainable land management approach which supported biodiversity and carbon sequestration. With regard to access to the site, he noted that there would be a net decrease in requirements, particularly with regard to heavy machinery, compared to the field's historical use for grazing and haylage as he would only need to visit to check on stock and for propagation; there would be no need for additional infrastructure.

The recommendation that prior approval be granted was moved and seconded.

DECISION: That prior approval be granted for the proposals based on the revised plans received 15 December 2020 and in accordance with conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents and lighting.

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 each case.

The appeal in respect of retention of partial timber cladding to existing cottage at Pinch Cottage, Newgale had been dismissed and a copy of the decision was appended to the report.

The other appeal related to refusal of a dwelling at Feidr Uchaf in Newport which had been determined contrary to the officer recommendation. The Director advised that she would be in touch with those Members who had proposed and seconded the application over the next couple of days.

NOTED.

<p>The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held 10 March 2021 without amendment</p>

