

# Development Management Committee

29 January 2025

## Present

Dr M Havard (Chair)

Councillor M Bowen, Councillor D Clements, Councillor T Evans, Councillor C George, Dr R Heath-Davies, Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor B Price. Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall, Councillor V Thomas, Councillor A Tinley, Councillor M Wiggins and Councillor C Williams.

## Officers in attendance

Mr C Felgate (Solicitor), Mrs S Morris (Director of Place and Engagement), Ms K Attrill, (Development Management Manager), Ms B Gledhill (Planning Officer), Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes)

[Virtual meeting 10.00am – 11.20am;  
11.30am - 12.30pm]

### 1. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr M Kent (Monitoring Officer), Mrs S Hoss and Mrs J James.

### 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>
General Declaration	Dr R Plummer	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting

### 3. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on the 4 December 2024 and 20 January 2025 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

On the proposal of Councillor Hancock, seconded by Councillor Clements, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 4 December be confirmed and authenticated. On the proposal of Dr Havard, seconded by Councillor James, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on 20 January be confirmed and authenticated.



#### 4. **Members' Duties in Determining Applications**

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, with particular focus on the purposes and duty of the National Park. It went on to outline the purpose of the planning system and relevant considerations in decision making, and the Solicitor added that consideration also needed to be given to the National Development Framework - Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 adopted by the Welsh Government on 24 February 2021 as well as its own Local Development Plan 2. The report also noted that the Authority also had a duty to carry out sustainable development, ecological considerations which included the role of the Environment Wales Act 2016, human rights considerations, the Authority's guidance to members on decision-making in committee and also set out some circumstances where costs might be awarded against the Authority on appeal. Mr Felgate added at the meeting that the report didn't mention that the Authority's decisions were subject to scrutiny and could be subject to a judicial review and it was therefore important that they were lawfully based. As the meeting was being held online, Members were also reminded that they had to be present for the entirety of the discussion on an application in order to be able to vote.

**Noted.**

#### 5. **Right to speak at Committee**

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011, amended 16 June 2021, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak unless they had spoken on the same application previously when they would have 3 minutes in which to present new information (*the interested parties are listed below against their respective application(s), and in the order in which they addressed the Committee*):

<b>Reference number</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
NP/15/0417/FUL Minute 6(a) refers	Retention of agricultural building (Structure 13) and lay down area – Trewern, Felindre Farchog	Mr Wyn Harries, Agent
NP/24/0596/FUL Minutes 6(c) refers	Allow habitable rooms in consented building, along with link to existing dwelling – Lleine, Nevern	Mr Wyn Harries, Agent



## 6. Report of Planning Applications

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

- (a) Reference: NP/15/0417/FUL  
Proposal: Retention of agricultural building (Structure 13) and lay down area  
Location: Trewern, Felindre Farchog, Crymych, Pembrokeshire, SA41 3XE

It was reported that this application was a retrospective application for an agricultural building (structure 13) and retrospective consent for the addition of a lay down area to the western end of the farming complex.

Since this application had originally been registered in 2015, Welsh Government legislation concerning the processing of Major application had altered, and the applicants had since provided a PAC (public application consultation) report which had been publicly consulted on prior to the re-submission of this application. The red line had also expanded from the original, to account for the lay down area extension to the western end of the site, however it was noted at the meeting that the line shown on the plan within the report pack was incorrect and the correct version was shown on screen. The updated registration date for this application, with the new information provided was the 23 October 2024.

It was noted that there was a complicated planning history for the site, as set out in the report. The proposal was part of a wider complex of buildings, and the last to be regularised of those included within the current Planning Enforcement Appeal which followed an Enforcement Notice issued in 2018 and which was still being held in abeyance by PEDW. Some of the buildings forming part of the original application had subsequently been granted Certificates of Lawful. The officer noted that if the application was approved that day, the appeal would then fall away.

Members had recently viewed the site as part of a Development Management Committee Site Inspection (minute 3 refers) from the important public viewpoint at Pentre Ifan to see its impact in the landscape, and drone images taken from here were shown at the Committee.

It was noted that the close proximity of the site to the Tŷ Canol SSSI and North Pembrokeshire Woodlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC), which was an old sessile oak wood with an exceptional diversity of rare



epiphytic lichens, had meant that proposals to increase livestock numbers had required appropriate assessment under the Habitat Regulations to assess potential impacts. The design and siting of the building was considered acceptable within the wider complex of buildings. Subject to conditions in relation to both landscaping and control of maximum milking herd numbers, to ensure there were no potential additional ammonia impacts on the SAC, the proposal was considered acceptable and to meet relevant Local and National planning policy requirements. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) had been agreed by Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and therefore the recommendation was to approve the application subject to conditions.

The Solicitor sought clarification on paragraph 2.4.7 of the report which noted that subject to appropriate conditions relating to herd size the proposal was likely to be acceptable following the completion of a Habitats Regulations Assessment. Officers confirmed that the conclusion of the appropriate assessment was that the application would have no impact on the integrity of the SAC and NRW had agreed with that conclusion.

It was noted at the meeting that there was a typographical error in condition 6 which should have referred to Building 14, rather than Building 1. The condition required replacement of translucent sheeting which would reduce the lighting impact of the building. It was also requested that a surface water drainage condition be included as SAB (Sustainable Drainage System Approving Body) consent did not apply. Finally the officer advised that the temporary calf housing noted by Members while on the site visit was not shown on the plans and would not be authorised as part of the current application.

The Chair noted that the Agent, Mr Wyn Harries, was available to answer any questions, but he did not otherwise wish to address the Committee.

Members were concerned about regulation of herd numbers, including contingency plans should there be movement restrictions as a result of TB, and they were assured that there would be an annual statutory declaration which could be verified through tag numbers and periodic enforcement visits. Officers considered that the wording of condition 4 was sufficient, having been agreed as part of the HRA and approved by NRW. The Solicitor reminded Members that falsification of a statutory declaration was a serious matter.

Several Members also expressed concern regarding the calf housing, with associated metal stanchions and concrete panels, which they had noted was quite prominent in the landscape, and also that its siting on the lay down area could displace parking and storage uses into the adjacent field.



The Agent, Mr Wyn Harries was asked to comment and advised that herd numbers had been static for 5-6 years, the number of cows having reduced as welfare standards were raised. He added that there were TB auctions which could be used to move cattle on if that proved necessary. He noted that this was a 'flying herd' whereby all calves were sold and all of the replacement heifers bought in from other sources. He confirmed that there was no intention to put a building where the calf domes were currently situated and stated that some of these had been on site for a number of years and would be screened by the proposed landscaping.

Officers suggested that an additional condition be included limiting the use of the lay down area to that specified in the planning statement i.e. not for livestock, and amended the recommendation to one of delegated approval to allow for a suitably worded condition to be drafted. It was noted that further discussion would take place with the applicant/agent regarding the calf domes, which would not be authorised by this planning permission, if granted.

It was proposed by Dr Heath-Davies, seconded by Councillor Clements that approval of the application be delegated to officers to allow for drafting of an additional condition to control the use of the lay down area. The proposal included also conditions as set out in the report including amendment of condition 6 to refer to building 14, and an additional condition in respect of sustainable drainage. This was carried.

**Decision: That the application be delegated to officers, in consultation with the Chair/Deputy Chair, to grant consent subject to conditions in respect of approval as a S73A application, biodiversity enhancements, landscaping, limit to herd size with submission of annual statutory declaration, lighting, removal of translucent panels from buildings 13 and 14, drainage and use of the lay down area.**

[The meeting was adjourned between 11.20am and 11.30am]



- (b) Reference: NP/24/0567/FUL  
Proposal: Demolition of existing toilets/showers/store/ laundry building (removal of touring caravans for reception) to an alternative site outside flood zone, with expansion with replacement toilets/showers/store/laundry/ reception office building with ecological and landscape enhancements (revision of refused application NP/23/0534/FUL)  
Location: Newgale Coast Holiday Park, Newgale Camping Site, Newgale, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6AS

It was reported that consideration of this application had been deferred until a future meeting.

**Noted.**

- (c) Reference: NP/24/0596/FUL  
Proposal: Allow habitable rooms in consented building, along with link to existing dwelling  
Location: Lleine, Nevern, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0NY

It was reported that this application sought consent to allow habitable rooms in an outbuilding which had previously gained planning permission under application ref NP/22/0571/FUL, together with the erection of a link to the existing dwelling. The current application followed the refusal of application NP/24/0391/FUL, which also sought consent to allow habitable rooms in the previously consented building, and the construction of a link to the main dwelling.

A site visit had been undertaken on the 20 January 2025 by Members of the Committee, and the minutes of that meeting were found elsewhere on the agenda (Minute 3 refers).

It was considered by Officers that the proposal under NP/24/0391/FUL represented an over-development of the original dwelling by introducing additional accommodation and built form over and above that which had been granted under application NP/22/057/FUL.

As part of this current submission, the proposed link to the dwelling had been reduced in terms of its scale by approximately 14m<sup>2</sup>. Whilst officers acknowledged that this would reduce the proposed built form, it was still considered that the further additional built form would be an over-development of the existing dwelling, which had already been extended extensively. The recommendation was therefore to refuse planning permission.



At the meeting, the officer noted some typographical errors in paragraph 2.1.9 of the report – the original floor space should have been recorded as 74m<sup>2</sup> with an attached coal shed to give a total of 86.9m<sup>2</sup>. 18.6m<sup>2</sup> had been added in 1994, not 40.5m<sup>2</sup>, however the remaining figures were correct and the additions that had already taken place represented an increase of over 100% of the cottage's original floor area. This was considered to be over-development and intensification of the residential use. The overall length of the proposed structure was also of concern, with the extension filling the gap that currently separated the residential use from that used for agriculture/storage.

Responding to some questions that were raised at the site inspection, it was noted that no external lighting was proposed as part of the application, however officers were concerned about the potential for light spill from glazing on the northwest elevation arising from the residential, rather than storage, use of this building. In response to a question from a Member it was suggested that use of a tint could be explored if the Committee was minded to approve the application. It was also clarified that the rear of the proposed extension would be finished with corrugated metal cladding with a corrugated metal roof, while the front elevation would match the host property. Finally, it was confirmed that no response had been received from the Tree and Landscape Officer.

The Agent, Wyn Harries, then addressed the Committee. He drew attention to the simple, rural setting of the existing dwelling and stated that there were no plans to change this but to protect and preserve that setting. It was intended to replace the post-war buildings, currently used as a utility/laundry/storage room, but change the position slightly to avoid the water main. The buildings had formed part of the residential curtilage of the dwelling since 2008, and had not been used for agricultural purposes for decades. Replacement of this building had already been granted consent, and under that permission it was possible to read a book in the building, but not to sleep. He considered that the discrete extension sought would not impact on the setting, and having sought pre-planning advice from officers, the size of the link and the level of glazing had been reduced. The proposed materials would ensure that the buildings would be read as part of the host dwelling. He noted that Supplementary Planning Guidance asked for bedroom accommodation to be linked to the host dwelling, rather than creation of a separate unit, and this was what was being sought.

Referring to views of the property, Mr Harries noted that the proposal was not visible from the coast path. Lleine could be seen at a distance from Pencastell to the northeast, but he believed it would be difficult to pick out



the link. It would be barely visible from the road, and he did not consider that it would change the character or impact on the host dwelling.

In summary, he concluded that planning consent existed to replace and rebuild the outbuildings sympathetically, subservient to the main dwelling and with no impact on the dwelling or the view. Permission was only being sought to connect the two buildings and allow the outbuilding to be used as two bedrooms with no impact on the character of Lleine or the National Park. He added that the applicants would agree to removal of permitted development rights which would give greater protection to the setting of Lleine going forward.

The Development Management Manager noted the reference to Pencastell and added that some Members of the Committee would recall that it had previously approved an application to demolish that property because it had been over-extended and had subsequently lost its character as a result.

A question was asked regarding the maximum size of extensions and officers advised that no limits were set out, but that it was a subjective judgement. While acknowledging that the character of buildings could be lost through over-development, several Members expressed support for the proposal, which would provide an attractive addition which would improve the site, leading to a better impact on the area. It was also noted that many buildings changed over time, as families grew, and the view was expressed that the proposal before the Committee was sympathetic and enhanced the landscape.

The Solicitor asked officers that if Members were minded to approve the application contrary to the officer recommendation whether the Cooling Off procedure would be invoked. The Director replied that as such a decision would relate to interpretation of policy – in this case design and landscape – rather than being contrary to policy, the procedure would not be invoked. However she asked that if Members were minded to approve, that the application be delegated to officers to allow appropriate conditions to be included.

A motion to delegate approval of the application to officers was moved by Dr Plummer, seconded by Mr Jones. Reasons given for going against the officer recommendation were a different interpretation of policy in relation to design and the development not being harmful to the special qualities of the National Park. It was requested that conditions in respect of control of lighting and removal of permitted development rights be included together with others considered appropriate by officers. When put to the vote this was carried.





**Decision: That the application be delegated to officers, in consultation with the Chair/Deputy Chair, to grant consent subject to conditions in respect of control of lighting and removal of permitted development rights being included together with others considered appropriate by officers.**

**7. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 10 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. It was noted that subsequent to the officers report an appeal at Tretio had been dismissed and would be reported to the next Committee

**Noted.**

