

Yr Hen Felin, Upper Bridge Street Newport Pembrokeshire SA42 0PL  
[sandrabayes@talktalk.net](mailto:sandrabayes@talktalk.net) Tel 01239 820889

Ifor Jones, Head of Planning and Conservation,  
Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority,  
Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock. SA72 6DY

10<sup>th</sup> May 2009

Dear Mr Jones,

**Bettws Newydd Newport NP/08/361 : Application of JUDP policies**

I am copying this letter to Mr Parsons, PCNPA Monitoring Officer, as I will be including the matters covered here in my ongoing complaint concerning the Authority's handling of conditions attached to the 2006 consent for Bettws Newydd.

You will be aware that the National Park was advised on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2008 by Mr David Forsdick of Landmark Chambers, that the application NP/08/361 should be considered under s.73A because it is retrospective. **This would mean that the (Authority) would have to look at the whole planning merits afresh... the application has to be judged against the development plan. JUDP policy 56 will be relevant...**

Yet the Officers' Report to the Development Management Committee three months later, whilst listing policy 56 amongst 15 other relevant policies, gives no further information on its relevance.

Under the heading, Main Considerations, it is stated, "The key considerations in dealing with this case are whether the development meets adopted planning policies, and should the development not meet those policies whether there are any other material considerations that would indicate that the development should go ahead contrary to those policies".

Without explaining how the development does not meet those policies, the Report then states that the "valid planning permission relating to the site will need to be taken into account in determining this application", devoting a whole page to mostly minor differences between what is confusingly termed the "original approval" and the current application.

I now wish to quote from your Report to the PCNPA Monitoring Officer, in response to my complaint alleging maladministration in granting the 2006 consent for Bettws Newydd.

**"I do feel that there are good practice points arising from the complaint that the Authority should recognise and take action on. Specifically in the case for applications for replacement dwellings – and other redevelopment proposals – the Officers' Report should make specific reference to the comparative siting, size and heights of the existing and proposed buildings as relevant contextual information. ... I would propose to issue instructions to this effect."**

In your conclusion you clearly state that you will take steps to apply such good practice points where they have not already been acted upon.

Why is it therefore, that no objective criteria for judging the current retrospective application against the development plan, particularly policy 56, were presented by the Development

Management Officers to the Committee? Such criteria should have been given clear prominence.

I asked to speak on this subject to the Committee in March but was told verbally that it had not been part of the Officers' Report because **"it had been covered on the Bettws Newydd Opposition website"**, that this was **"only a preliminary report"** and that speakers were attending the April meeting (which I was unable to do).

The Report to the April meeting at last stated,  
**"This report will first consider the proposed development with regard to adopted planning policies; and secondly with regard to other material considerations."**

But where oh where were the objective criteria by which the Committee could come to a decision? Where is any accurate information on the **"comparative siting, size and heights of the existing and proposed buildings as relevant contextual information"**?

This was still left to the Bettws Newydd Opposition Group and other speakers to desperately try to put across in the very limited time made available to speak.

The success of the Officers' Reports in informing the Committee that the application must be judged against the Development Plan and only if the application does not meet those policies should other material considerations be taken into account, can be measured in the Chairman's statement before the vote was taken at the April meeting when Cllr. Brinsden said, **"In 2006 we gave planning consent. All this is to do with the consent we gave – nothing to do with the cottage that was there before. I fail to see that changes are sufficient to refuse planning – We would certainly be overturned on appeal."** (Copied from the handwritten notes from the meeting on the planning file).

I put it to you that you have failed to properly convey the Advice that you have received in this matter to the Members of the Development Management Committee. In my view this is largely due to your not following your very own recommendation by setting out objectively the differences between the original and replacement dwellings.

Would you be good enough to reply to this letter by explaining why this did not happen. Will you also ensure that such objective information is included when your officers report to Committee in May so that Members are able to adequately judge whether the **"additional requirements"** to be brought before them will bring the application into compliance with JUDP policies before coming to a decision.

Yours Sincerely, Sandra Bayes

cc Mr Parsons, Monitoring Officer to PCNPA

Mrs Sandra Bayes

cc Mr Parsons

Mrs Milner