

Draft Minutes of Llangors Community Council PAD Meeting
Held on Wednesday 3rd June at 18:15 at the car park of Llangasty Village Hall

Members present: Cllr D Scully (Chair), Cllr A Jevons, Cllr G Beaven, Cllr C Owen, Cllr C Preece, Cllr D Jones.

In attendance: Hannah Davies (Clerk)

1. Welcome and participation rules for the meeting – Chair

The Chair reminded all in attendance of the participation rules for the meeting.

2. Apologies for absence

Cllr S Bailey and Cllr H Quarrell.

3. Declarations of interest for agenda items as per Members' Code of Conduct

Cllr S Bailey notified of a declaration of interest via email after seeing the planning application. The application is a neighbour.

4. Consideration of the following planning matters, members having viewed the recently presented documentation online prior to the meeting.

Planning Applications:

- a) **BBNPA 26/24643/FUL - The Coach House, Cynghordy, Llanhamlach Brecon Powys - *Proposed open-fronted building for agricultural use***

Cllr G Beaven drew attention to an earlier application (24/23392/FUL) that sought permission to convert a nearby redundant lambing shed into a single bed holiday let which the Council supported and it was approved. The current application seeks permission to build an agricultural building in the adjacent field that resembles the lambing shed and he was aware of local concern that the new building is a replacement that might eventually form the basis for further residential development.

He further advised that other than describing the building as for agricultural use no information is provided in the application documents about the purpose and need for the proposed building. This is despite relevant BBNPA planning policy which states that new farm buildings will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the need identified cannot be accommodated through the conversion of existing buildings or that a new building is necessary. He also confirmed that unusually for a farm building a full planning application is required because the proposed building is to be located within 25 meters of the highway and it is also in close to some residential dwellings.

In this situation, after discussion the members present agreed that further information was needed in order to be able to fully establish that the proposed building would only be used solely for a purpose appropriate to its location. Other than this concern it was recognised that the proposed site was already being used for storing agricultural materials, it was well screened and that no new access onto the highway would be needed.

Cllr G Beaven then explained that the Council had been made aware of local concerns about the application which he summarised to be the potential for damage to an existing septic tank, the unjustified need for a new agricultural building and its potential further uses, the adverse impact on local residential properties and a lack of transparency in the application.

He recalled that the location of the septic tank had been examined during the during the site visit when it was noticed that the area in question was already used by farm vehicles and any increase was unlikely to be significant. Also, the applicant was already responsible for and was paid for the maintenance and effective operation of the septic tank and would want to protect this service to local residents and their own property rather than put it at risk.

With regard to the need for a new building this had already been discussed. He confirmed that the current application must be judged on what it proposed and any development beyond this would be the subject of further applications.

He also recalled a recent application considered by the Council to create a habitable dwelling that had been refused by the Powys CC Planning Authority due to the close proximity of an agricultural building that could potentially give rise to amenity problems. The potential amenity issues of concern to PCC would have been unacceptable levels of noise, dust, air pollution, litter, odour and hours of operation. Although Powys CC was the Authority for that application the National Park has similar policies.

Although useful background the buildings in question were only 5 meters apart and the Authority also explained that their conclusions might have been different if the agricultural building been owned by the applicant. With the current application most of the residential buildings were more than 50 meters from the proposed building with the applicant's own dwelling being the most affected. Although it would depend the use of the building the potential for significant loss of amenity was considered to be very low.

With regard to a lack of transparency this is a common complaint which is why the need for additional information is often included in consultant's comments on planning application documents.

After consideration the members present felt that apart from the lack of information about the use of the building the specific local concerns would not be explained in the Council's submission to the planning Authority although the existence of local concerns needing to be fully investigated would be highlighted.

They concluded that they could support the application providing that the use of the building was explained, it was suitable for the proposed location and made a condition of any permission granted.

Cllr Beaven was asked to draft a suitable consultancy response for further consideration before submission.

Note

Subsequent to the meeting the following draft submission was circulated and approved:

After careful consideration the Community Council will support the application providing that the exact purposes for which the agricultural building is to be used are confirmed, they are suitable for the proposed location and are made a condition of any granted permission. The Council is also aware of some local concerns which, if they be submitted to the Authority, should be investigated fully.

5. Consider any other planning applications received

There had been no other planning applications received.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 18:27.