

Draft Minutes of Llangors Community Council Planning Application Decision meeting**Held at Llangasty Village Hall Village Hall on Thursday 27 June 2024**

Members present: Cllr D Scully (Chair), Cllr S Bailey, Cllr Mrs C Owen, Cllr G Beaven, Cllr Mr D Jones, Cllr Mr C Preece

In attendance: Hannah Davies (Clerk), Mr M Gentle from Green Parks, Mr D Phillips from Avison Young.

1. Welcome and participation rules for the meeting.

Cllr Scully welcomed those present and explained that the rules for participation in a normal Council Meeting would apply.

2. Apologies for absence: Cllr Helen Quarrell, Cllr A Jevons,

3. Declaration of Interest for agenda items as per Members' Code of Conduct: None

4. Consideration of the applications, following members having viewed it online prior to the meeting: -

BBNPA 24/22850/FUL 22 Apr 2024

The Change of use of land and buildings from overnight accommodation by school children using the facilities at the Outdoor activity centre to the use of land and buildings for overnight holiday accommodation and 3 additional holiday cottages including reconfiguration of existing car parking and enhancement to existing on-site restaurant.

Royal Oak Camp Llangorse Brecon LD3 7TR.

As the Community Councillor who oversees and is representative for planning issues on Llangors Community Council Cllr Beaven addressed the meeting.

Cllr Beaven explained that the above application had been considered at the PAD held on 9th May and a draft submission was approved by the Council at the monthly meeting on 14th May 2024. At the time the Council was aware that the Applicant wanted to have an informal meeting to discuss the Council's concerns but we took the view that we would respond in full to the consultation within the published deadline for comments. This would allow the Applicant to address these concerns via the Authority's public domain. The consultation period for this application has now been reopened which is giving the Council an opportunity to re-consider its position in light of the Applicant's written response that comments on the Council's earlier submission.

Cllr Beaven explained he found the Applicants response to be disappointing as it had not provided the expected further clarity or reassurances on any of the Council's key concerns. In fact the response appears to ignore many of the Council's detailed comments. Consequently he felt that the the Council's original submission dated 18 May 2024 was still a fair representation of the Council's concerns and position. Cllr Beaven then provided details of the main reasons for this advice.

A particular concern is that the description of development, as quoted at the top of this letter, does not mention that permission is also sought to extend the season of use whereas the Applicant's response claims that this description captures the scope of the application 'entirely'. As this description of development is quoted in supporting documents it is unclear whether the extended season has been taken into consideration. For example the Ecological Appraisal is a very important

supporting document and the impact of the proposed extended season is not mentioned anywhere within it. Mr Gentle confirmed that those undertaking the Appraisal were fully aware of the full scope of the application and had assessed the impact of whole year occupation. He offered to provide further information to confirm this with details of the work undertaken.

Cllr Beaven recalled that the Council's submission states that as permission has already been granted for the plan amendment the Council could support the change of use but there are too many concerns with the current application. He felt that the Council and presumably other consultees should reasonably expect that the plans for the land and buildings recently approved under 23/21931/CON 18/4/23 and the approval conditions would still apply except where a specific change is proposed by the current application but there were two examples where this appears not to be the case. During the consultation for 23/21931/CON 18/4/23 the Council and other consultees expressed concerns about the potential for light pollution from the glazed roof panels of the Snowdon Pods and consequently a new design was approved with a solid roof. However the Design Statement for the current application includes an Elevation Plan for the Snowdon Unit that reinstates the glazed roof design. For the same reason a proposal to improve the shielding provided by the site's boundary hedges was confirmed by a note on the approved site plan. However the proposed site plan with the current application fails to include this note making no comment on the treatment of the site's boundary hedges.

Mr Gentle explained that the current application seeks only to further develop the earlier approved application through a change of use, season extension and conversion of existing buildings. The Snowdon Plan drawing was included in error as it took no account of the later approved changes and new site plan did not need to include all of the details provided by the approved site plan. The Council was being given a mistaken impression by the approach being taken to apply for the proposed changes to the approved application and he provided reassurance that the Authority understood fully what was being proposed. He offered to provide further clarity on the planning approach and the proposed outcome to allay the Council's suspicions.

Cllr Beaven explained that the Council's submission stated that it needs more information about how the site would be operated in order to be reassured that it would blend in with the existing local facilities but no such information has been provided.

Mr Gentle explained that this information had not been provided as it was not needed for the planning application. He confirmed that a warden would be present to ensure that the blinds were drawn as required by the approval condition and that the restaurant would be Bistro style and open to the public. There would be restrictions on its operation to ensure that it did not adversely impact on the local area.

Cllr Beaven recalled that in its original submission the Council opposes the proposed 5 month extension to the approval occupancy condition believing that operation of the site should be constrained to align with the very long established holiday season that is applied to all the other local leisure facilities.

In reaching this conclusion the Council was trying to assess the balance between the economic and some social benefits generated by increased tourism and its potential adverse impact on the culture and well-being of local communities. For the summer season the Council concluded that it could support the change of use part of the application providing its outstanding concerns were addressed. However, for the winter season the Council concluded that the balance was changed as the current respite period would be lost to both the local community and the environment.

Therefore the Community Council concluded that the local holiday season should be respected and it opposes the proposal to extend the sites use to whole year occupation. None of the comments in the Applicant's response have adequately addressed the issues raised in the Council's submission.

Mr Gentle explained that fundamentally their proposal would represent an improvement over the earlier use of the site as not only would the density of occupation be less but it would be spread more evenly throughout the year helping to iron out the peaks and troughs resulting from the current extreme seasonality in the area.

Several Councillors expressed their support for concerns raised by Cllr Beaven. Cllr Bailey asked whether an arrangement would be viable which offered some recognition of the need to reduce the impact of winter occupancy whilst keeping some parts of the site economically active. Mr Gentle said that he would be prepared to consider such an approach.

Cllr Beaven then explained the confusion over the applicability Policy 46 and its core requirement for a seasonal occupation condition. Mr Gentle explained that in their view Policy 46 was no longer relevant as it had been satisfied by the permission already granted and the conditions attached to that permission. The current application sought to change some of those conditions.

In general discussion Mr Gentle expressed the Applicant's concern that the in considering this application the Council was not adequately reflecting the balance of local opinion or the opinion of the whole Council. Several Councillors defended the Council's approach and Cllr Beaven's representative role on the Council.

After due consideration the Council concluded that would it would be beneficial if they were able to consider the further information and assurances that were on offer and continue the dialog rather than respond to the re-consultation in the required timetable. In welcoming this proposal Mr Gentle said that they would ask the Authority for a time extension and try and allay the Council's concerns now that these were better understood.

Cllr Beaven was asked to respond to the Authority to explain that a meeting had taken place, that further information would be provided and the Council would not be responding to the re-consultation at this time.

5. Consider any other planning applications received.

None

Cllr Beaven to respond to the consultations.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.30 pm.