

The Old Mill, Upper Bridge Street, Newport,
Pembrokeshire, SA42 0PL
Tel 01239 820889

Catherine Milner
Development Management Officer
PCNPA
Pembroke Dock,
SA72 6DY

5th April 2010

Dear Mrs Milner,

Bettws Newydd Parrog Newport NP/10/033: Newly dimensioned application drawings and documents

You have kindly sent me this new information electronically. This includes

- ⇒ Application Drawings now showing the levels and heights of the application scheme – the as-built and as proposed scheme and landscaping to above ordnance datum level (AOD);
- ⇒ Design and Access Statement revised to show these amended dimensions and
- ⇒ Statement of Method in carrying out proposed earthworks and a Planting and Mulching Statement.

I have also received from you a circular letter sent also to other objectors, dated 31st March, in which you state, “**They** (the amended changes) **do not change anything...**” and also “**nothing has changed**”

Your statements are misleading because the new information in fact lends support to the arguments of those who oppose this application.

In terms of judging the current application against Joint Unitary Development Plan policies, the height difference between the ridge of Jimmy’s house and the as-built dwelling is now known to be even greater than has been thought i.e. it is a massive 6.89m or 22 feet 7½ inches higher.

There can be no question that it is massively more visually intrusive than the only valid “original dwelling” on the site, which was “Jimmy’s house”.

You have not told correspondents that it is “anticipated” that 60-70 lorry loads of “material” will be required to carry out the new landscaping proposals. This draws attention to the fact of the huge earthworks, mostly required

to cover up the lower level of the East elevation to make it look like the elevation pictured in the 2006 stamped approved drawing.

What most objectors also do not know, and this is a fact that National Park Officers have denied, is that a very great deal of material was already imported onto the site to cover up the West (entrance) elevation in a similar way back in the Spring of 2007.

The Officer Report to the Development Management Committee of October 2009 states, "*The 2006 dwelling was presented in the approved drawings as having been sunk into the surrounding land*"

However the developer, having been granted consent with no levels on the drawings stamped approved, did not proceed to sink the building into the ground at all, but instead set the Ground Floor of the replacement dwelling a full storey above the ground level of Jimmy's house.

Thus the developer must now attempt to make the as-built dwelling look more like the pictures of the approved elevations by putting banking up against the building. However, the building itself still remains a storey higher AOD than "*as presented*" on the approved drawings.

If the approved plans had been followed, and a building in compliance with policy 56 had been constructed from them, then the ground floor of the replacement dwelling would have been set at around the ground floor level of Jimmy's house. The replacement would have been set at least 3.5 metres (over 11feet) lower and the as-built dwelling's ridge height would be more than 4metres (over 13 feet) lower than it is now.

In addition of course, the whole development would have been sited about 5 metres further away from the public footpath as it passes the entrance to the site.

The replacement would then have been markedly less visually intrusive than it is now and **none of this massive importation of material, which is contrary to Park policy, would have been necessary.**

Yours Sincerely,

Sandra Bayes