

## STATEMENT OF GROUNDS.

### [1] Conflict with National Planning Policies

“ If the proposal conflicts with national planning policies. The publication ‘Planning Policy Wales’ sets out what the national planning policies for this country are.”

#### Planning Policy Wales (2002)

### Preservation of special landscape character in National Parks

5.3.4 The statutory purposes of National Parks are to conserve and enhance their natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and to promote opportunities for public understanding and enjoyment of their special qualities.

....

5.3.6 National Parks and AONBs are of equal status in terms of landscape and scenic beauty and both must be afforded the **highest status of protection from inappropriate developments....** In National Parks and AONBs, UDP policies and development control decisions should give **great weight to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of these areas.**

**(emphasis added)**

This Authority in reaching its present decision has, by the blatant admission of several of its own members in committee, ignored completely the provisions of the UDP policies created to meet this national planning requirement, most especially as respects the provisions of JUDP Policy 56 which explicitly requires, as a bold text policy matter, that permission for a replacement dwelling house will not be granted unless the replacement building would be “*no more visually intrusive*” than the building which it replaces.

### Protection of the setting of Heritage Coastline

5.7.4 Policies should aim to protect or enhance the character and landscape of the undeveloped coastline. Planning policies to be pursued in **Heritage Coast** areas should be incorporated in UDPs. Designation as a heritage coast does not directly affect the status of the area in planning terms. **However, the features which contributed to the designation of such areas may be important in formulating planning policies or making development control decisions.**

The coastline in question faces directly toward and forms a part of the visual context of the Moylegrove St Dogmaels Heritage Coast which starts at its southern end here in Newport. However, this fact was never even considered by the PCNPA.

### Preservation of the setting of a Buildings Conservation Area

6.4.7 UDP policies should make it clear that development proposals will be judged for their effect on the character and appearance of **conservation areas**, as identified in the assessment and proposal document, to ensure that any new development is in accord with the area's special architectural and historic interest. ....

6.5.15 If any proposed development would conflict with the objective of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area, or its setting, there will be a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission. In exceptional cases the presumption may be overridden in favour of development deemed desirable on the grounds of some other public interest. The courts have held that the objective of preservation can be achieved either by development which makes a positive contribution to an area's character or appearance, or by development which leaves character and appearance unharmed

The site in question is immediately adjoining the designated Newport Parrog Buildings Conservation Area, the preservation of the setting of which has previously resulted in the upholding by a WAG Planning Inspector of a previous decision by the PCNPA to refuse consent in the next field but one, also merely adjoining this CA, for merely a garage cum boathouse on the grounds, inter alia, that it failed to preserve the setting<sup>1</sup>. Do you not consider that there are reasonable grounds, as can be seen in the many national and international press photographs, that such is true therefore of this site also in this instance as a part of the setting of that area, and under JUDP Policy 79

The development of land **adjoining, or near to**, a Conservation Area will only be permitted where it would have the effect of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area or its setting, taking into account the foregoing criteria.

We respectfully invite you to examine the assessment of the PCNPA's Conservation Officer in his Report to the DMC last Wednesday on this topic, and with respect to this development, to see if you reach the same conclusion as ourselves with respect to its objective rationality.

## Overall Housing Objectives

### 9.1.1

The Assembly Government will seek to ensure that:

....

- new housing and residential environments are well designed<sup>3</sup>, environmentally sound (especially energy efficient) and make a significant contribution to promoting community regeneration and improving the quality of life; and that

---

<sup>1</sup> Application 03/066 ; Made 04/02/2003; Refused 25/03/2003  
Mr Millar, Swn-y-don, The Parrog, Newport  
Extend curtilage; erect garage/boat store Grid Ref : SN04823970

- the overall result of new housing development in villages, towns or edge of settlement is a mix of social and market housing that retains and, where practical, enhances important landscape and wildlife features in the development.

## **Specific Control of insensitive redevelopment**

9.3.3 **Insensitive** infilling or the cumulative effects of development or redevelopment, including conversion and adaptation, **should not be** allowed to damage an area's character and amenity. This includes any such impact on neighbouring dwellings, such as **serious loss of privacy or overshadowing.**

Here we merely invite you to examine the many pictures on the website and ask yourselves the inevitable and obvious questions.

### **[2] Substantial wider controversy**

“If the proposal may give rise to substantial controversy beyond the immediate locality.”

We hazard to suggest that it is not every replacement dwelling house application that receives the scale and detail of both Welsh Regional and National media coverage which this application has. We invite you to examine the following HTP links.

<http://erwwen.com/parrog/images/090411-dailymail.jpg>

<http://erwwen.com/parrog/images/090411-telegraph.jpg>

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1168972/Facing-demolition-shed-turned-1m-showpiece.html>

<http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/article2372066.ece>

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/wales/south\\_west/7997948.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/wales/south_west/7997948.stm)

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/wales/7926326.stm>

<http://www.walesonline.co.uk/news/wales-news/2009/03/09/protesters-go-online-against-eyesore-91466-23096524/>

I am uncertain whether this kind of adverse media coverage, which as we see it highlights the inability of an LPA to uphold good planning practice and protect this most widely respected and loved National Park landscape, is the kind of controversy you have in mind but we feel it certainly meets the criterion.

Finally, since you are bound to look at these things from the perspective of Cardiff Bay we would invite you to consult with the many respected and influential people from your part of the world who also hold this part of the world in very high regard and ask them what they think about this decision./

**[3] Significance of effect on important landscape**

“ If the proposal is likely to significantly affect ... areas of landscape importance.”

Frankly if you are still left in any serious doubt, as to the applicability of the above criterion with respect to this prominent site, next to a designated buildings conservation area, overlooking a heritage coastline, just above the cliff top in our nation’s only coastal National Park, we invite you to come and make an objective independent assessment for yourselves.

~~~~~