

**Raglan Community Council**  
**Minutes of the Special Site Meeting Cefn Tilla Road, camping site**  
**for 7 temporary shepherd huts**  
**on Saturday 5 November 2016 at 10.00 am**

**Present**

Cllr Ewen Brierley  
Cllr Vivienne Compton  
Cllr Penny Jones

Cllr Richard Moorby  
Cllr Trevor Phillips  
Cllr Peter Williams (Chairman)  
Cllr Helen Williams

**4159 In attendance:**

Adrian Edwards, Clerk to the Council.  
Nine members of the public were in attendance

The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that there will be a process the meeting will need to follow, and invited the clerk to explain.

**4160 Agenda 1:-** Apologies for absence.

Cllr's Dennis Brown, Noel Porter, Ray Parry and Sylvia Price

**4161 Agenda 2:-** Declarations of interest.

Cllr Richard Moorby declared a personal interest but the interest was not a prejudicial interest. Cllr Moorby remained at the meeting as an observer

**4162 Agenda 3:-** Planning applications

**DC/2016/01128:** Cefn Tilla Road, camping site for 7 temporary shepherd huts

Change of use of land from agricultural use to a camping site for 7 temporary shepherd huts to be occupied between the 1st March and the 31st October annually and associated access roads and a new toilet block.

The chairman thanked everyone for attending and invited the clerk to give members and members of the public background information relating to the planning application that was withdrawn and the current planning application that is being considered.

The clerk gave members a clerk's report, highlighting a number of issues members would need to consider when considering this application. He apologised to the members of the public that he didn't have sufficient copies to hand around but the report will be included in the minutes of the next council meeting.

He explained that he believes the developer should have consulted the local community and the locally elected members a minimum of 28 days before submitting the application. He also explained that the red area on the application is far greater in size than the area proposed for the Shepherd Huts.

Report attached in appendix 1

**4163 Agenda 4:-** To allow members of the public to address the sub-committee.

One member of the public made reference to the statement made in the design statement, that the agent and the developer stated the land is not viable and livestock cannot use the land due to the land not being livestock proof due to the fencing, but the land has a substantial number of sheep grazing on it.

A number of the public made a number of observations relating to this Planning Application. Concern was expressed over the increase in traffic flows and the impact the proposed development will have on the open countryside and the light pollution.

Concern was expressed over the construction of the toilet block and the size and the impact the building will have on the open countryside. One member explained that a number of dwellings have water extraction from local water courses and the application has no indication where the proposed septic tank and the secondary drainage will be installed. After some debate it was:

**Proposed:** the community council should make objections to this development, as the development does not follow a number of the LDP Policies.

**All members agreed.**

**Resolved:** to object on the policies identified in the clerks report

**4158** The Chairman thanked everyone for attending. The meeting closed at 11.05 am

Signed by \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman Cllr Peter Williams  
Date 23 November 2016

**Report to:- Raglan Community Council**

**Subject: - Planning application at Cefn Tilla Road, camping site for 7 temporary shepherd huts**

**Report:- by the Clerk**

**Date:- 5 November 2016**

Raglan Community Council received the cover letter dated 25 October. Raglan Community Council considered the above Planning Application at their Full Council meeting on 26 October 2016. Members were minded to convene a site meeting so everyone was able to see and make relevant observations. In the first instance members should be mindful the application site is estimated to be four or five times larger than the proposed development. Members must be mindful if the application receives consent the applicant may be able to apply for relaxation of any conditions and apply for an extension to the overall site. The applicant has identified in the design statement 9.0 Conclusions, the site has potential to become a very successful tourist destination and contribute to the estate.

This application can be considered as a major development and the application should have been accompanied by a Pre-application consultation document. In order to be valid and this must include a copy of the site notice. The declaration should confirm the applicant has placed the notice and undertaken the relevant consultations. It is clear from the documentation submitted with this application the applicant nor his agent have consulted with the local community or the Local Community Council allowing them a minimum 28 days before submitting their proposed Planning Application to the Planning Authority.

The applicant nor his agent have placed site notices informing members of the public that this site will be considered by the local Planning Authority as a proposed development site. The applicant nor his agent as not informed or consulted adjoining neighbours, informing or carried out any consultation with community locally elected members and Community Council. The documentation shows no indication that the applicant has consulted Natural Resources Wales, Cadw, and other utility providers. On this basis the community council believes this Planning Application cannot be validated.

The current application would seem to be in conflict with **3.7 in TAN 6**). The Planning Authority when considering Planning Applications for farm diversification projects should consider the nature and scale of activity taking a proportionate approach to the availability of public transport and the need for improvements to the local highway network. This application again is not showing or providing any evidence that a survey or consultation has been complied with.

The current application would seem to be in conflict with **3.10.1 TAN 6**). The farms plans would support any application, relating to any farm diversification proposals. All such plans should demonstrate how the diversified activity fits into the wider farming practise, and set out its **environmental consequences** highlighting how any significant adverse effects will be mitigated.

- a) *Business and Improvement plan to identify whether there is a need to live on the site and establish the level of the inhabitants' requirements in terms of income, food energy and waste assimilation that can be obtained directly from the site.*
- b) *Ecological footprint analysis of the development. Carbon analysis of the development.*
- c) *Biodiversity and landscape assessment.*
- d) *Community impact assessment to identify potential impacts on the host Community (both positive and negative) and provide a basis to identify and implement any mitigation measures that may be necessary.*
- e) *Transport assessment and travel plan to identify the transport needs of the inhabitants and propose sustainable travel solutions.*

Comments relating to the applicants design statement

**Design statement 3.0;** in the design statement the agent describes the site as a relatively level site. The engineering drawing (CTC 08) shows no datum levels for the proposed site. This drawing also indicates that the proposed road way will follow the existing gradients and will be constructed from a 200mm hard-core base and a 50mm gravel topping. The applicant or his agent has provided further engineering drawings showing the gradients and levels of the shepherd hut basis.

**Observations:** The existing site is on a steep incline from the road edge to the hedge line on the west side of the proposed development. Therefore the statement in the design statement is incorrect and misleading. The engineering drawing CTC 07 indicates the steepness of the gradients of the site. Drawing CTC 07 shows the within an estimated 150m from the back edge of the highway the land falls away an estimated 2m. The main part of the site is further into the proposed site layout.

**Design Statement 4.0;** The applicant's agent makes a statement the site is a small site which will be integrated into the parkland and enhanced natural environment.

**Observations:** The proposed development is in the middle of the parkland in open countryside where there are no existing hedges or tree cover to screen the proposed site. The agent explains that the proposed development will enhance the natural environment and to respect the existing traditional field pattern, the existing field pattern is open Parkland and countryside. The proposed development will be set in the middle of open parkland and countryside. This proposal is to construct a toilet amenity block in the middle of open parkland with no existing buildings or distinguishing land marks around the proposals. Therefore the design statement made is incorrect and misleading.

The applicant states in the design statement that the amenity block will be constructed from timber and cladded with horizontal timber along with timber shingles on the roof. The proposed toilet amenity block will be constructed in open parkland and will be conspicuous in its design and location in the open parkland

**Observations:** The design statement makes no reference to drainage or the disposal of waste water. The application form indicates that the toilet amenity block will be served by a septic tank. No drawing shows where the septic tank is going to be constructed and the secondary drainage layout. The exiting site and the gradients are so steep in their nature, any septic tank system will need to be constructed west on a more level part of the proposed development site. To construct a septic tank on the lower levels further roads will need to be constructed to allow service vehicles to manage and empty the system.

**Policy Statement:**

- The current design and application is in conflict with **Policy S17**- the application does not respect the character of the site and its surroundings in order to protect and enhance current parkland and open countryside, and would not appear to be attractive and sustainable.
  
- The current design and application is in conflict with **Policy S13**, by not maintaining the character and quality of the landscape and conflicting with sub-sections in Policy S13, 'preserving local distinctiveness' 'sense of place and setting' 'respecting and conserving specific landscape features, such as hedges, trees and ponds' and not 'protecting existing key landscape views and vistas'.
  
- The current design and application is in conflict with **Policy RE6**. The proposed development is small in scale but is in conflict in appearance and character as this development is in open parkland and countryside and will be visible from a number of vantage points.
  
- The current design and application is in conflict with **Policy T1**, the proposed development is small in scale but is in conflict with the subsections below:
  - a) *there is no unacceptable impact on the countryside having regard to biodiversity, landscape quality and the visibility from roads, viewpoints and other public places.*
  - b) *there are no permanently sited caravans.*
  - c) *the development can be satisfactorily supervised without the need for additional permanent living accommodation for wardens; and*
  - d) *there are no adverse safety and/or amenity effects arising from the traffic generated and access requirements.*

**Observations:**

- Under **Policy T1**,

a) the proposed development is small in scale but is in conflict with the policy. The development is in open parkland and countryside and will be visible from a number of roads and viewing points from local panoramic vantage points.

c) It's clear from the application and the road infrastructure to this proposed development, it will have a detrimental effect on road safety due to movability of increase traffic movement on narrow roads with insufficient passing bays

- Under Policy **DES2**.

Areas of Amenity Importance. The proposed development is in open parkland and countryside and will be visible from a number of roads and viewing points from local panoramic vantage points. The applicants agent has confirmed in the design statement that the land is registered parkland

*a) the visual and environmental amenity of the area, including important strategic gaps, vistas, frontages and open spaces;*

*d) the cultural amenity of the area, including places and features of archaeological, historic, geological and landscape importance;*

- The current design and application is in conflict with **Policy S10** on the basis the development is in open parkland and countryside. The Policy states this is to enable the farm diversification of the rural economy and the Planning Authority could permit development outside local settlements and local boundaries, where it is of a scale and type compatible with the surroundings and will cause no unacceptable harm to the surrounding landscape. Built into the Planning Authorities LDP it makes reference that the applicant must demonstrate that there are no existing buildings suitable for conversion/re-use in preference to new build.

*a) in relation to new build, the applicant must demonstrate that there are no existing buildings suitable for conversion/re-use in preference to new build.*

**Observations:**

This proposed application is in conflict with Policy S10. The proposed development is of a scale and type not compatible with its surroundings and will cause unacceptable harm to the surrounding open parkland and existing landscape

Information within the design statement is insufficient and provides no robust detailed information.

- There are no landscaping statements, identifying a planting schedule.
- Landscape Character Assessment, is required to demonstrate how the landscape character has influenced the design and, scale of the development
- No comment or report from CADW or the registered landscapes of outstanding historic interest in Wales & Registered landscapes
- The land survey does not identify all of the existing ground levels and the amount of excavation and engineering work required
- The engineering drawings show very little detail about the excavation required and construction levels of the proposed toilet block and pitches for the Huts.
- There are no drawings or statements identifying septic tank sewage and drainage system.
- There is no evidence provided that an application has been submitted relating to the diversion of the existing public Right of Way
- There is no environmental impact assessment.
- There is no waste collection policy for storage and collection.
- There is no traffic impact assessment.
- There is no highway maintenance programme or assessment.
- There are no reports or recommendations from NRW relating to the construction of the septic tank sewage system.
- There is no evidence how the applicant will conform to Policy DES4 – Advance Tourism Signs.
- No consultation under the Town and Country Planning Development Management Procedure (Wales) Order 2016
- There does not appear to have been any consultation with MCC Environmental Health Department
- The Community Council would like to bring to the attention of the Planning Dep't if the applicant provides a new vehicular access the applicant should contact the Highway Authority in relation to Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. It must be acknowledged the that any permission pursuant to Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980 must be obtained prior to commencement of access works.

It can be considered the proposed application is in conflict with the following policies in Monmouthshire County Councils LDP that was adopted in February 2014.

Policy LC1,

Policy S10,

Policy S13,

Policy S17,

Policy DES2,

Policy T1,

Policy RE6

Resolution from Raglan members

