**Cyngor Cymuned Amroth Community Council**

**Draft Minutes** of Extraordinary meeting held by Amroth Community Council on Tuesday 4th April 2023.

**Councillors present:**  T Baron; A Cormack; A Evans; F Evans; R Harris; M Harvey; R Lake; M Morris; S Phillips (Vice Chair). R Tippet Maudsley; E Wyn Morgan.

**In attendance:** Mrs Kathryn Bradbury (Clerk), Several residents from Summerhill

**Apologies**: John James, Eleri Wyn Morgan.

**Declaration of interest.** None

1.Chairmans Welcome

The Chairman welcomed Councillors and Members of the public to the meeting. He stated that the plans for Planning application 22/0921/PA had been heard three times previously under different application numbers and been refused each time. At this meeting it was for Councillors to hear comments in favour or against the application and to identify any material changes that had been made to the application which would negate the previous objections.

2. The Chairman read out the list of Valid Planning points and stated that Councillors would only hear comment relating specifically to one of these which are

1. A Planning application is at odds with the Local Development Plan -[https://www.pembrokeshire.gov.uk/local-development-plan](https://gbr01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.pembrokeshire.gov.uk%2Flocal-development-plan&data=05%7C01%7C%7Cfeab2a8ca84d421c01e908db348ced9e%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C638161552100158254%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=moeMNRt%2FrbNCXmOhiURj99pGrJNzIFn9EB6ypwvHzH4%3D&reserved=0)
2. Material considerations. These include but are not limited to access, overlooking/loss of privacy, loss of light or overshadowing, parking, highway safety, traffic noise,
3. A Planning application is at odds with National Planning Guidance drafted by the Welsh Government

**3. County Cllr. Alec Cormack**

Following the Community Council meeting on 23rd March 2023, Cllr Cormack had attended two meetings with officers at County Hall regarding the possible sale of land from No 17 Summerhill to the planning applicant, Mr Brooks. Contrary to Mr Brook’s belief and his presentation to Councillors on March 23rd, Officers confirmed that no decision has been made to sell any land. They also confirmed that the County Councillor would be notified in advance of any land sale, so he could advise the community and Community Council to allow everyone to submit comments or bid.

Cllr Cormack explained that if PCC decide to dispose of an asset (including land) it should be publicly advertised, except in exceptional circumstances. If exceptional circumstances prevail then the cabinet still must be informed, of which Cllr Cormack is a member.

If the planning application is passed it still cannot go ahead if the land (at No.17) is not purchased and the Community Council can request that no work starts until the land in question has been properly and legally authorised.

Cllr. Cormack stated that it is important that there is a clear understanding as to what is happening to all the land in the estate, as additional parking is needed due to the constrained design of the estate.

Cllr Cormack will communicate all information he receives to residents.

He has formally submitted a request that the application be heard by planning committee and not by delegated decision. The request has not been granted yet as the committee has not yet met. May 15th, 2023, is the decision date but this can be extended with agreement.

**4. Cllr Baron opened the floor to comments and a full discussion took place**

A question was posed that the planning application and the land sale are two separate issues.

Cllr Baron explained that legally anyone can apply for planning on any land, and it can be granted – but this does not mean it will be built. Also, that Council owned land for sale should be publicly advertised unless it is as a community asset transfer to a community organisation for e.g. the Community Council

Cllr. Cormack suggested that all land in the area be reviewed as to best use.

Cllr Baron reminded residents to keep all comments strictly on the planning application before us. He read out the original objection from Nov 2020 and asked in what way had changes to the application negated any of these objections.

A resident reminded the meeting that a resident had passed away at 23 Summerhill 16 years previously as the ambulance could not get the resident out to the ambulance quickly enough due to obstructive parking.

Cllr Baron reminded residents that the Community Councill was one voice and holds the same weight as an individual objection. He advised that all comments be submitted to PCC Planning either via the planning portal or via email.

**Q to Cllr Cormack** – re land at no 17. ‘This land could provide several parking spaces for anyone – not private parking for no 18 and next door’.

Cllr Cormack responded that discussions had taken place without the County or Community Councillors being aware. Nothing will move forward with the sale of the land at No.17 without it being made public first and other parties could bid.

**Q**. If the land is sold what will happen to the money? Cllr Cormack responded saying ‘recognising that the estate only has so much land – we should be looking at the whole area and see what land could be used and best use for it’.

**Comment**. Mr Brooks plans are beneficial in that it provides additional accommodation and additional parking.

**Resident at no 17 requested to speak.**

No. 17 is overlooked on all sides. The resident has been told that the land is to be sold. Conversations have taken place. Council workmen entered the property at No.17 with the view to moving the oil tank without permission. At this point the resident left the meeting.

Another resident commented that many properties were overlooked on the estate from the day the houses were built so why is this now an issue? The Clerk commented that legislation has changed since the houses were built and overlooking is now a material planning consideration.

A query was raised about Drone flying and privacy. Cllr Lake commented that there was legislation in place and any concerns should be reported to the police.

A resident commentedthat theResident at no.17 will lose land back and front without her agreement.

Cllr Cormack again assured residents that Mr Brooks may have had discussions, but the land will not be sold without the community being notified.

**Q.** Concern was raised about a statement made at the meeting on the 23rd March that the applicant had met with the CEO of PCC and been assured that the land would be sold and why was this not included in the Minutes of that meeting. The Clerk responded to say it was not included as it was not pertinent to Councillors discussion regarding the planning application.

The sale of the land was again raised. Cllr. Cormack has it in writing that no decision has been made regarding the sale of the land.

A resident commented that the parking issue primarily effects the properties close by to no 18 and its garden.

**Q** If planning is approved, will it strengthen the applicant’s ability to acquire the land at no.17 – The answer is no.

**The discussion continued with comments from residents including..**

-the applicant’s probability of selling one or both properties – Cllr. Baron reminded residents that this has no bearing on the application.

**-** road safety – Main concern is extra traffic and safety of residents and resident’s children.

- Hall parking by users is dangerous. Cllr. Tippet Maudsley told the meeting that members of the hall committee had been in touch with PCC about additional parking for the hall but this had not progressed to date.

- Some garages are owned by people that don’t live on the estate.

Cllr Cormack suggested that if residents believe that parking spaces are reduced that is a valid planning objection. Highways have stipulated that an additional three parking spaces be included and while this was not objected to last year it does not preclude residents of including this in objections to this application.

A question was raised re Delegated v Committee decision. This has been requested by Cllr. Cormack. He stated that the Planning Committee meeting is publicly broadcast so residents can see who votes for and against. Cllr Cormack can speak at the planning meeting as can the applicant and one resident who can speak for all. A site visit can be requested.

In drawing the discussion to a close, Cllr Baron summarised the main points raised.

* 1. No. 17 -concern about overlooking and a significant part of the garden could be lost if land is sold.
  2. Strong and clear concerns about increased traffic and safety aspects, especially relating to emergency vehicles with examples of major issues being presented. But the obstructive parking is further down the road so is this valid to the application? Work vehicles should be parked on site whilst working if the application is approved.
  3. If more parking became available to residents, this would be welcomed.

Cllr Baron proposed that Parking is added to the next ACC meeting agenda and asked Cllr Cormack to take up the issue.

* 1. Overlooking through the Velux windows to no.11 & no.12.

Cllr Baron thanked residents for their comments.

5. **ACC Comments**

A full discussion took place.

The application in January showed drawings submitted that were for a 3 storey 5 bedroomed house and 2 parking spaces.

Amended drawings have since been submitted showing the house moving back in the plot and a two story, 3 bedroomed house. Why has the drawing not changed –it no longer needs three parking spaces, and the build could have stayed where it was. The drawings do not make sense. Current plans suggest there may be an intention to expand in future?

Rafters are pitched but same head height so is it easier to get a three bedroomed house through planning than 5 bedroomed then expand under permitted development?

**Cllrs agreed that if the application was to be approved, ask for a condition to be included that permitted development rights be denied and that any future conversion be subject to planning application.**

Cllr Philips – Proposed that ACC object based on overlooking and traffic movements.

Cllr. Harries – Listened to both meetings – if PCC commit to improve parking to start with, then an extra plot would make no difference. But without this, the additional property is not advantageous to the estate. Access is important and if emergency vehicles cannot get through then it becomes a huge safety issue. Access needs improving before planning is allowed. He proposed to Object.

Cllr Baron – access road is too narrow on both sides but that is for highways to determine. The valid objection is overlooking and lack of privacy. A three bed house does not radically change this. There will be a small increase in traffic- but dosen’t see that this application decreases the parking. The the volume of traffic passing up and down a restricted road must be a concern. Agree that access must be addressed but it will not happen in time for this application.

Cllr Cormack proposes that ACC object on conditions stated and to propose conditions if planning is approved.

1. If planning is granted the applicant must gain legal rights over all land not already under their ownership and control, edged in red on plans 258DHR/02B, as well as over the land labelled new access which forms part of the public highway.

2. Implement proposed parking arrangements layout as shown on 258DHR/15

3. Recommend that permitted development rights to expand the property in anyway will require full planning for this to happen.

**Agreed, ACC will object on grounds outlined and will include conditions if planning is approved. County Councillor try to ensure it is withdrawn from delegated to full planning Committee.**

**Vote was unanimous.**

**6. Payments**

Audit Wales -£284

Film Media Distribution- £164.40

Welsh Water Dwr Cymru £97.20

**Proposed Cllr. Roger Harries Seconded Cllr. Stephen Phillips. Vote Unanimous**

Fencing Contractor – Emyr Jenkins of Pembrokeshire Fencing quoted the lowest price for the specified materials and work. **Cllr Phillips proposed he be awarded the contract, Cllr. Harries Seconded. Vote-unanimous**

**Not on the Agenda- update - Buses**

Taf Valley stopping the 351 service at the end of April when WG are extending the financial support to June. PCC website shows that no buses are operating over the summer. Concern that there will be no tender applicants. Is there an opportunity to extend?

Cllr Cormack will follow up and report back.

**Meeting ended 21.20pm**