

Statws/Status:

Cyhoeddus / Public



**Adroddiad Adolygu Dylunio:
Design Review Report:**

22 November 2007

Dyddiad Cyfarfod / Meeting Date:

14 November 2007

Lleoliad/Location:

Harbour Heights, Saundersfoot

**Disgrifiad o'r Cynllun
Scheme Description:**

Residential

**Cleient/Asiant:
Client/Agent:**

Mr Peter Le Petit

Developer/Datblygwr:

n/a

Pensaer/Architect:

**Argent Architects
[Michael Argent]**

**Awdurdod Cynllunio:
Planning Authority:**

**Pembrokeshire Coast
National Park**

**Statws Cynllunio:
Planning Status:**

**Planning application submitted
May 2007**

**Y Panel Adolygu Dylunio/
Design Review Panel:
Wendy Richards (cadeirydd/chair)
Cindy Harris (swyddog/officer)
Charlie Deng (swyddog/officer)**

**Carole-Anne Davies [CEO]
Howard Wainwright**

Lead Panellist:

Cindy Harris

Cyflwyniad/Presentation

This is a very tight, steeply sloping, south facing site, dug into the hillside at the top end, in the town centre of Saundersfoot. The existing 2/3 storey house is divided into flats and is not part of this application. The applicant seeks to replace the three 'chalets' to the rear of the plot with a 'mews type' terrace of three units, running down the western boundary, for year-round occupation. The new 2 storey, 3 bed units all face south to exploit solar access and views, and will incorporate solar water heating. It is claimed that this is a highly sustainable development on a central brownfield site, increasing both density and amenity.

The access road is realigned to follow the eastern boundary which, it is claimed, will double the current parking capacity and be much easier to negotiate. Each new unit will have a carport plus one other parking space. Access to the highway remains the same but with a lower front boundary wall. Otherwise boundary walls are preserved. Hard and soft landscaping will clearly delineate public and private space.

The Local Authority has delegated powers to determine this application and they currently intend to refuse it on the grounds of access, amenity and over-development. The access argument centres on: restricted visibility and width at the county road entrance; the gradient of the access road; and insufficient space for a turning circle.

Ymateb y Panel/Panel's Response

The architect claimed that there was no significant impact on the property to the west, Little Court, as the first floor patios are set back from the western boundary. However, the Panel pointed out that this setback appeared to measure only 2.75 metres, which we thought was not enough to prevent overlooking. In addition the impact on the skyline from the west might be considered significant for residents of Little Court.

The Panel was informed that objections to the proposal from the occupant of Oaktree Cottage to the north were based on inaccurate information regarding the height of the proposed development. Nevertheless we thought that the current proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site and we advised that a reduction in the number of units to two or even one large unit would reduce the impact to the north and give more external amenity space around each of the units. We noted that the proposed ground floor courtyards were very small and likely to be shaded for most of the time.

The architect stated that a two-unit solution was unlikely to be economically viable. Nevertheless the Panel thought that, in view of the building layout, parking

arrangement, and slope of the site, it was doubtful whether three units could be physically accommodated. From a liveability point of view, we found the current proposal unsatisfactory. Given that the units are intended for year round occupation, and are of a size to accommodate families, we thought that there was insufficient outdoor amenity space proposed for residents of these three bedroom dwellings.

The Panel noted that the parking standards [currently at 200%] might be reduced, and this would benefit the site layout and the sustainability credentials.

The Panel was disappointed at the lack of a clear sustainability strategy and any commitment to EcoHomes standards. The architect stated that this might be introduced later in the process, with the sale of the site to a developer, but we thought this was unlikely .

Crynodeb/Summary

The Panel agreed with the Local Authority that the proposed development was unacceptable, being too intensive for the site, and that its relationship with neighbouring properties and the general context was likely to be problematic. In summary:

- We think there are real issues of overshadowing and privacy in relation to Little Court.
- A reduction in parking numbers would create more usable external space and benefit the scheme as a whole. It may also help to resolve some of the Highways issues.
- We applaud the aspirations to sustainable development but we are disappointed at the lack of any real commitment to achieving a measurable low-carbon performance standard.

Diwedd/End

NB A Welsh language copy of this report is available upon request.