

Development Management Committee

15 July 2026

Present (In Person)

Councillor Dr SL Hancock (Chair)

Councillor D Clements, Councillor C George, Ms H Gwenllian, Dr M Havard, Councillor H Murphy, Councillor V Thomas, Councillor C Williams and Councillor M Williams.

Present (Remotely)

Councillor M Bowen, Miss F Day, Mrs S Hoss, Councillor M James and Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall.

Mr GA Jones joined virtually prior to consideration of the Solicitor's report (Minute 4) and Councillor A Tinley joined during consideration of application NP/23/0435/FUL (Minute 6(a))

Officers in attendance

Ms K Attrill, (Development Management Manager), Mr C Felgate (Solicitor), Mr J Houser (Planning Officer), Mr M Kent (Monitoring Officer), Ms Toni Macey (PCC Highways), Mrs S Morris (Director of Place and Engagement), Mr R Scourfield (Building Conservation Officer), Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes)

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock and Virtually 10.00am – 11.15am;
11.20am – 1.25pm]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Mr J Hogg and Councillor B Price.

2. Disclosures of interest

The following Member(s)/Officer(s) disclosed an interest in the application(s) and/or matter(s) referred to below:

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
Minute 6(b) below NP/26/0145/FUL - 1 small timber woodfired sauna & associated booking hut – Saundersfoot Harbour, Saundersfoot	Councillor C Williams	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed



3. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 3 June 2026 and 24 June 2026 were presented for confirmation and signature.

On the proposal of Councillor Hancock, seconded by Dr Havard, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 3 June 2026 be confirmed and signed.

In respect of the minutes of the meeting held on 24th June, it was noted that the date of the meeting in the English minutes should have read 2026 rather than 2024.

On the proposal of Councillor Hancock, seconded by Councillor Clements, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 24 June 2026 be confirmed and signed subject to the above amendment.

Noted.

4. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, with particular focus on the purposes and duty of the National Park. It went on to outline the purpose of the planning system and relevant considerations in decision making, and the Solicitor added that consideration also needed to be given to the National Development Framework - Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 adopted by the Welsh Government on 24 February 2021 as well as its own Local Development Plan 2. The report also noted that the Authority also had a duty to carry out sustainable development, ecological considerations which included the role of the Environment Wales Act 2016, human rights considerations, the Authority's guidance to members on decision-making in committee and also set out some circumstances where costs might be awarded against the Authority on appeal. Finally, the Solicitor added that the report didn't mention that the Authority's decisions were subject to the scrutiny of the courts and could be subject to a judicial review and it was therefore important that they were lawfully based.

Noted.

5. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7th December 2011, amended 16 June 2021, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak unless they had spoken on the same application previously when they would have 3 minutes in which to present new information (*the*



interested parties are listed below against their respective application(s), and in the order in which they addressed the Committee):

Reference number	Proposal	Speaker
NP//23/0435/FUL Minute 6(a) refers	Change of Use of land for the formation of 11 touring caravan pitches, tent pitches & the siting of 3 shepherd's huts. (Part retrospective to include retention of existing storage shed & facilities building) - Land to the East of Talbenny Hall Farm, Talbenny	Alison Gibby – Objector Zac Addison – Agent
NP/26/0145/FUL Minute 6(b) refers	1 small timber woodfired sauna & associated booking hut – Saundersfoot Harbour, Saundersfoot	Kerry Evans – Applicant Phil Baker – Supporter Cllr Chris Williams (County Councillor)

6. Report of Planning Applications

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Development Management Team Leader, together with any updates reported verbally on the day and recorded below. The Committee determined the applications as follows (*the decision reached on each follows the details of the relevant application*):

- (a) Reference: NP/23/0435/FUL
 Proposal: Change of Use of land for the formation of 11 touring caravan pitches, tent pitches & the siting of 3 shepherd's huts. (Part retrospective to include retention of existing storage shed & facilities building)
 Location: Land to the East of Talbenny Hall Farm, Talbenny, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this application sought planning permission for the change of use of a former scrapyard site, which had been remediated and more recently operated as a seasonal campsite, to provide a seasonal formal camping and glamping site comprising 11 touring caravan pitches with electric hook-ups, a designated camping area for up to 20 tents, and



three shepherd's huts. The application also sought retrospective consent for the retention of an existing storage shed and a facilities building.

During officers' consideration of the application, a significant amount of additional information had been submitted in response to consultee comments. In particular, the Local Highway Authority had initially objected to the proposal on highway safety grounds pending the submission of further technical information. A seven-day traffic speed survey, Access Appraisal and revised visibility drawings had subsequently been submitted, following which the Highway Authority withdrew its objection, subject to planning conditions.

The application was presented to the Development Management Committee as the proposal related to a new tourism development in the countryside, and because The Havens Community Council had maintained an objection on highway safety grounds.

The site would operate as a medium sized seasonal tourism development between 31 March and 30 September each year. The applicant had confirmed that the three shepherd's huts would be removed from the site outside the operating season and stored within the existing onsite storage building.

Officers considered that the previously developed nature of the site, its enclosed landscape setting, seasonal operation and the resolution of technical matters relating to highway safety, ecology and drainage demonstrated overall policy compliance with the requirements of the LDP2 and the proposal was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

It was noted at the meeting that the application had been subject to several revisions since its submission, including one to the red line highlighting the extent of the site; this was shown incorrectly in the Committee papers and a map showing the correct extent was presented. It was noted that one of the Shepherd's Huts was also retrospective. Since writing the report an update had been received to the Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) with which the Ecologist was content, subject to the inclusion of two additional conditions requiring provision of bat boxes and replanting.

The officer reported that following the submission of the additional highways information and further comments by an objector, the Highway Authority had conducted a site visit and concluded that visibility was adequate, subject to appropriate verge maintenance. The Highways Officer, Toni Macey advised the Committee that traffic volume on the highway was low and average speeds were 32.7 mph in both directions,



therefore a 50m visibility splay was adequate and that this could be obtained through a requirement for the applicant to cut the verge; a failure to do so could be enforced. Also as trip generation was low, there would be few occurrences of two vehicles entering/leaving simultaneously. In response to a question, she added that use of the site for seasonal camping (28 days per year) had not led to road safety concerns and no accidents had been reported on the stretch of road in the past 26 years.

As a result it was recommended that Condition 2 be amended to reference the additional highways documentation, visibility splays set out in condition 10 (numbered 7 in the report) be amended and Condition 9 (numbered 6) be removed as this was no longer required as the width of entrance was considered to be adequate.

In answer to other questions from Members, the officer confirmed that the shared access track was owned by the adjacent farm, and that from a conversation with the applicant she understood that the intention was to site motorhomes only, rather than caravans, however this could be clarified with the agent when he spoke later in the meeting.

The first of two speakers was Alison Gibby, who was objecting to the application. She began by expressing her surprise and disappointment at the amended conditions. She believed that the widened entrance was needed, explaining that she had monitored the entrance with a CCTV camera for the past few years and had often witnessed vehicles queuing on both sides of the gate. She also noted that she had sent photographs to the Authority (which she understood had been uploaded to the website) of the visibility from her own vehicle and stated that the visibility splay could not be maintained by cutting as she had asked a surveyor to look at the bank and it consisted of concrete blocks topped with a hedgerow. She also disagreed with the Highway Officer regarding visibility looking right from the entrance. She understood from the report that visibility in that direction should be 215m and this could not be obtained. Ms Gibby noted that the Community Council had agreed with her.

Ms Gibby went on to note that the campsite was advertised as being centred around two wildlife ponds and believed that a second field would be used in addition to the one for which permission was sought and that the reduction in size of the application site had been done to avoid the added burdens of submitting a larger site. She concluded by saying that she didn't believe that a drainage field could be obtained from the septic tank as the area would be used for parking and she understood that drainage under a parking area was not allowed.

The Chair first asked the Highways Officer to respond. She clarified that the application had not previously been recommended for refusal but the



Highway Authority had advised there was insufficient information and had asked for a speed survey. She noted that such surveys were not carried out at the junction but on the approach; as the survey had demonstrated that traffic was travelling at less than 60mph (most at less than 45mph, and an average of 32mph), visibility splays could be reduced and that 50m in both directions would be satisfactory. A requirement to widen the access road had been removed due to the low volume of traffic leaving and entering the site; she advised that the road had not been busy on the occasions when she had visited.

In response to a question, Ms Gibby advised that she did have other objections to the application, other than highways matters, which related to removal of trees along the stream which had reduced the screening of the site from the road and concerns around drainage from the site due to the proximity to the parking area, stream and other buildings. She added that the site was surrounded by a busy working farm of 220 acres which also carried out contract work with machinery and this led to this traffic stacking up behind holiday makers trying to leave.

The second speaker was Zac Addison, the Agent. He explained that the site had been a scrap yard which had been cleared by the applicant to become a beautiful haven, and since it had been cleared had operated as a 28-day site. In answer to the earlier question, the applicant intended the site to be for motorhomes only and was happy for this to be conditioned and to cap the length of vehicles at 7m. The Agent noted that preliminary ecological assessments had been undertaken and these had been positive and that his client was happy to go above and beyond what was required for biodiversity enhancement, including swallow cups, swift boxes, hedge and tree planting as well as pollinator plants. Highways surveys had been undertaken as requested and the results had been fully discussed. Mr Addison explained that his client wanted the site to remain as a beautiful haven and had therefore only applied for 11 hard standing pitches, one tenting field for a maximum of 20 tents and three shepherd's huts. No concrete or tarmac was proposed, with the hard standings to be of a type 1 sub-base to allow for natural filtration. Permission was sought for three retrospective buildings – a toilet block, shepherd's hut and the storage shed, which had been an old airfield building which had been roofed over for storage for the caravan site. He added that his client was happy to maintain the highway verge to allow the visibility splay and noted that there was a flat area at the curb side which sloped up to the solid bank which could be cut.

One Member asked about noise and the distance from the campsite to the property not connected to it. The officer advised that the distance was 101m and that noise was not considered, in the recently amended General Permitted Development Order, if the nearest dwelling was over



100 meters away. The agent noted that there were hedgerows and trees in between which would break up the noise in any event.

Following confirmation from the Agent, the officer requested that condition 3 be amended to refer to motorhomes rather than touring caravans. She also noted that consent would be required from the Sustainable Drainage Approving Body (SAB) and that as a drainage scheme was required under Condition 4, the toilets would have to be blocked off until this was approved.

Members asked further questions regarding vehicle movements and storage of the shepherd's huts out of season. They were advised by the Highways Officer that on average 5 vehicle movements per hour would be expected, irrespective of whether these were campervans or cars, and this was not significant. The Agent confirmed that both the shepherd's hut and the associated decking could be removed from site or stored in the shed over the winter.

Members were content with the explanations about the access and removal of the shepherd's huts through the winter. They also commended re-use of a brownfield site, commitment to increased biodiversity and noted that as this site was inland it would encourage tourism away from coastal honeypot areas. It was hoped that as the Puffin Shuttle passed nearby this would encourage motorhome drivers to leave their vehicles on the site during the day. In order to address any concerns over noise, it was suggested that a noise mitigation condition be added. The recommendation of approval subject to conditions, including those amended at the meeting, was moved by Councillor Clements, seconded by Mrs Hoss and carried at the vote.

Decision: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, seasonal operation of the site, noise management, foul and surface water drainage, use of the shed, planting and replanting, external lighting, Construction Environmental Management Plan, access and visibility splays.

[The meeting was adjourned between 11.15 and 11.20am]

[Having disclosed a prejudicial interest, Councillor C Williams left the meeting at this juncture, sitting in the public gallery until he had spoken, and then withdrawing from the room.]



- (b) Reference: NP/26/0145/FUL
Proposal: 1 small timber woodfired sauna and associated booking hut
Location: Saundersfoot Harbour, Saundersfoot

It was reported that this application was being considered by the Committee at the request of a Member. The site was located in Saundersfoot Harbour, on the public footpath that ran east of the car park. Within this area, there were several retail and food outlets, including the units at Ocean Square, an ice cream booth and the Spar store. The site was also located within Saundersfoot's designated Conservation Area and the Coastal Change Management area identified in the National Park Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2).

The Committee was advised that a two-year temporary change of use of land to accommodate a mobile sauna had been granted in 2024. The current application proposed permanent retention of 1 small timber woodfired sauna and a new associated booking hut (retrospective), both located within Saundersfoot Harbour.

Officers considered that the principle locating the sauna and booking office within a Centre location was acceptable. However following consideration of the implementation of the temporary permission and given the greater extent of the current proposal, it was considered that the visual impact of the sauna and related booking office had now increased, but could be reduced by locating the sauna further back in the car park. This would also have the benefit of the sauna not requiring relocation during severe weather and increased flood risk.

The application, in its current form and with the proposed location of the sauna, was considered to result in a landscape impact that harmed the setting of the Saundersfoot Conservation Area, particularly when viewed from the beach and when looking seaward from the promenade. The sauna was also located in a position which reduced public access along the existing promenade route, which was considered to prevent appropriate access from being achieved and resulted in a development which was not well designed for pedestrians. In addition, since the temporary permission had been granted, Technical Advice Note 15 had been updated and there was now a requirement for a Flood Consequences Assessment for development in this location. The lack of a suitable Flood Consequences Assessment resulted in insufficient information to support the current application. The recommendation was therefore one of refusal.

At the meeting it was reported that a petition had been received in support of the development which had attracted 550 in person signatures. A late



submission by the applicant had also been received and this had been published on the Authority's website since the beginning of the week. Officers summarised the points made which related to the economic benefit of the unit to the harbour and strong local support. The applicant also considered that the location of the sauna was essential to its success, noting that it had received 5,500 bookings with 8,000 users during its two years of operation. Photographs had also been sent showing that raised flowerbeds, the electricity substation and cars in the car park provided screening.

The officer noted that while pedestrian access along the promenade was retained, it was reduced in width behind the Sauna. Account also needed to be taken of the Authority's Public Sector Equality Duty which included consideration of those with a visual impairment. The location was therefore not considered to be well designed in terms of accessibility.

Members asked about other units located on the harbour and were advised that permission for a change of use was only required for uses that were not ancillary to use of the harbour eg units for boat trips did not require a change of use permission. Permission had been granted for a van selling donuts. It was noted that the hut located adjacent to the retrospective booking office was removed out of season.

Another Member asked about lack of biodiversity enhancement and was advised that this matter had not been addressed as the recommendation was one of refusal, however it could be covered by a condition if Members were minded to approve the application.

Members asked the Building Conservation Officer, who was present, to explain what had changed since the temporary consent had been granted. He advised that the 2023 Historic Environment Act required that the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area be preserved and this area was described in the Authority's Supplementary Guidance as essential open space with key seaward views when walking along the promenade. He also expressed concern about precedent – not only in relation to additional units which could be located adjacent to the sauna, but in respect of the seafronts of other Conservation Areas. He considered that there might be scope for an alternative site within the harbour. Officers also added that temporary permission had been granted to see whether the use was appropriate in that location and it was now considered that it was not.

The first speaker was the applicant, Kerry Evans, who explained that since being granted temporary permission two years ago, the sauna had become a successful local business which was part of the fabric of the village. Since opening, thousands of people had used the sauna – more



than 5,000 bookings equating to around 8,000 people - and it was therefore clearly valued. However it also had value as part of the community, with the business donating vouchers for charity fundraising events and helping to raise money for good causes throughout Pembrokeshire.

Ms Evans explained that the current position of the sauna was fundamental to its success with its situation against the railings providing privacy, dignity and safety to customers whilst also allowing uninterrupted views across the bay, while the integrated changing area enabled people to change comfortably and privately. As a result of a business application to Welsh Government, part funding had been obtained for a freshwater shower beside the slipway which meant that people could easily move between the sea, the shower and the sauna. She believed that sitting in the sauna and watching the waves roll in was an unforgettable experience that could not be recreated elsewhere. She noted that the support from local people had been overwhelming and many businesses had supported the petition. The business was about creating healthier people, stronger communities and another reason to visit Saundersfoot, and, as it was a year-round attraction, the Sauna helped to extend the tourist season beyond the traditional summer months. Users then spent money in cafes, shops and accommodation and therefore contributed to the wider village economy. She noted that outdoor saunas were one of the fastest growing wellness activities in the UK and her business had been recognised by The Times as one of the top 20 saunas in the UK and had won a Sauna of the Year Award for 26/27. All of this publicity helped to showcase everything that the village had to offer.

Turning to practical matters, Ms Evans stated that the sauna had operated safely for two years and the public had continued to move freely around the site. During severe weather and exceptionally high tides, the sauna was moved and there were no incidents demonstrating that the approach was ineffective. The business didn't operate if conditions were unsuitable. Safety was paramount, with every member of staff first aid trained, emergency equipment kept on site, operating procedures followed and risk assessments undertaken.

Finally she explained that she had fallen in love with Saundersfoot and decided to move there because it was so special; she now wanted to give something back by creating a business that improved people's lives, reflecting the growing importance of health, well-being and sustainable tourism. She asked the Committee to look beyond the plans and drawings and to see all that the business had achieved during its two-year temporary permission - a valued part of the Saundersfoot community, an attraction which brought people to the village throughout the year,



supported local businesses, supported health and wellbeing and operated safety and responsibly.

While not doubting the health, wellbeing and economic benefits of the business, Members asked several questions regarding the location. Ms Evans confirmed that the booking office was needed to provide staff with somewhere to shelter when the weather was poor and to check people in. Other areas of the harbour had been considered but none were considered suitable, particularly due to the need for privacy which was afforded by the railings in front of the sauna. She considered that moving to another location or using privacy glass instead would change the offering and would make the business unviable. She also confirmed that the sauna did not operate when it had been moved due to adverse weather. She highlighted that at its narrowest point, the passable distance behind the sauna was 175cm which was considered ample (the minimum being 120cm, while 180cm was sufficient for two wheelchairs to pass). She noted that there were other areas around the village where accessibility was more restricted. In response to a question about future replacement of the structure, the officer replied that similar buildings would be permitted, as long as they met the parameters and measurements set out in any permission. A final Member question asked whether the business would consider paying to widen the promenade as a compensatory measure, however the applicant advised that this would not be financially viable and would in any case lead to a loss of biodiversity and screening as there was a raised flowerbed behind the structure.

The second speaker was Mr Phil Baker, speaking in support of the application. He said that he had initially thought that nothing had changed since the temporary application had been granted but then realised that the sauna formed part of the harbour redevelopment, which had received an award from the RTPI for regeneration and which had recognised the role of planning in creating a year-round destination, where new commercial, community and visitor facilities was supporting businesses, improving public access and driving regeneration, being praised as an exemplar for coastal economic resilience in smaller settlements and a good example of place-based regeneration. There were clear economic and community benefits and the role of planners in addressing issues had been recognised. The judges had commented that the project promoted accessibility, sustainability and local enterprise, however he was at the meeting that day striving to ensure that a small successful enterprise retained its ability to offer a unique selling point – the opportunity for visitors and residents to take a sauna with unrivalled views across the bay.

Mr Baker noted that the location had been carefully chosen and aligned with the building line of the nearest building to the south, screening



properties along The Strand. The structure was only 4.2m long and should anyone want to take in the whole vista of the bay, they had only to move 2.1m in either direction. He did not believe that the sauna sat on the footpath, but on a seafront promenade; the 'pinchpoint', where the distance was 1.8m wide, was caused by a security camera column. He noted that the nearest access ramp onto the promenade was also 1.8m wide.

Turning to the officer report, he noted that most consultees, with the exception of the Building Conservation Officer, offered no objection, and that one of the letters included a petition of 558 names. The business had established itself as a supporter of charities and good causes, and any threat to its viability and unique offering would have an adverse impact. He suggested that the well-being and community benefit, together with the sustainability of a small business far outweighed the reasons for refusal and on behalf of the supporters asked the Committee to support the application.

The final speaker was Councillor Chris Williams, speaking not as a Member of the Committee but as the County Councillor for Saundersfoot South, representing the views of residents, businesses and community organisations. He considered that those views were reflected in the significant level of public support the application had received, including a petition of 558 individuals, which demonstrated that the business had become a valued addition to the community.

Councillor Williams noted that when temporary consent had been granted, three potential locations had been identified to allow the structure to be relocated in high tides, storms or severe weather. One of the reasons for refusal of the current application concerned insufficient information in relation to the flood consequences assessment, however he asked Members to consider the evidence of the last two years which showed that the operators understood the sensitivity of the site and had demonstrated responsible management, with the sauna having been removed from site during periods of extreme weather without issue. He believed that this practical operational history should be given significant weight when assessing whether risks were capable of being properly managed. Turning to accessibility, he stated that he understood how busy the promenade became during peak periods. He noted that significant investment had been made to improve accessibility throughout Saundersfoot for wheelchair users, mobility scooters and pushchairs, with the resurfaced promenade, improved crossing points and active travel links contributing to making the village safer and more accessible for everyone. He added that he had not received a single complaint from residents or local businesses regarding obstruction or accessibility problems caused by the sauna.



Considering the visual impact, Councillor Williams believed that the current location worked well, with much of the structure screened when viewed from High Street. He considered that a more central location on the raised car park would make it more prominent within the harbour setting. Its current location also avoided obstructing the views enjoyed by those sitting in vehicles overlooking the bay. Finally he spoke about the wider benefits of the business to the community, with many organisations and residents expressing their support, including the Community Council. The Sauna had welcomed approximately 8,000 individual users, attracted visitors to the village throughout the year, extending the activity well beyond the traditional tourist season. He noted that the business had received national recognition, being featured in publications, national and media-world awards and had attracted visitors from far afield who might not otherwise have visited Saundersfoot. The recently installed beach shower was well used. The business also supported the local economy, with sauna visitors using local business and encouraging year round footfall and complementing the village's growing reputation as a destination that promoted health, well-being and outdoor recreation. As the elected County Councillor, he noted that the overwhelming feedback about the sauna had been positive. He acknowledged that planning decisions should be based on the planning merits of the application but believed that the evidence of the previous two-years had demonstrated that the sauna had operated responsibly and not realised the concerns that had been originally anticipated, becoming a valued addition to the harbour and the village community. He asked the Committee to support the application.

Councillor C Williams then left the room.

While recognising the benefits of the business to the community and the economy, most Members considered that the sauna in its current location obstructed the view and adversely affected the gathering and movement of people, with wheelchair users being particularly disadvantaged. Concern was expressed that other excellent businesses could also be sited on the promenade, setting a precedent and reducing access even further. Others believed that the structure added to the visual clutter and that the design was inappropriate in the setting, detracting from the historic core of Saundersfoot both historically and aesthetically. There was also concern about the view towards and from the beach, and it was considered that in many ways, the booking office sat in a better location among the other buildings than the sauna itself. The recommendation of refusal was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Councillor M Williams. It was requested that should the application be refused, discussions took place with the applicant to find a more suitable location. The recommendation was carried at the vote.



Decision: That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The development is considered to be sited in a location which will have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of Saundersfoot Conservation Area in that the proposed sauna structure will detract from the defined essential open area within Saundersfoot Harbour and its fine landscape setting when viewed from key views within the promenade area and prominent views into the conservation area from the sea and therefore is contrary to Policies 04 (Saundersfoot Local Centre), 08 (Special Qualities), 14 (Conservation and Enhancement of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park.), and 18 (Porthgain, Saundersfoot, Solva and Tenby Harbours), 29 (Sustainable Design), and 30 (Amenity) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2.**
- 2. The siting of the proposed sauna on the promenade, which reduces the passing width in this location, is not considered to result in a well-designed development for pedestrian access and is therefore contrary to criterion c) of Policy 59 and, criterion a) of Policy 60 of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2.**
- 3. The application is supported by a Flood Consequences Assessment (FCA), which fails to address the required information as set out within Welsh Government Technical Advice Note 15 (TAN 15), and therefore, officers consider that there is a lack of information to ensure that the submitted FCA demonstrates that the risks and consequences of flooding are manageable and meet the criteria set out within TAN 15 (Development, Flooding and Coastal Erosion).**

- (c) Reference: NP/26/0177/FUL
Proposal: To create a hardstanding at the entrance to Penlan
Location: Forestry entrance to Penlan, Gwaun Valley

It was reported that this application was presented to the Committee as the applicant was the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.

This application sought planning permission for the creation of a permeable hardstanding at the existing forestry entrance to Penlan, Gwaun Valley. The proposed hardstanding would provide an operational area to facilitate the long-term management of the wider 70-hectare conservation site, supporting native woodland regeneration, heathland restoration, grazing management and wider biodiversity enhancement.

The proposal had been carefully sited adjacent to the existing access, it incorporated sustainable drainage and was supported by ecological



mitigation measures. It was not considered to give rise to unacceptable impacts upon landscape character, biodiversity, residential amenity, highway safety, public rights of way or flood risk. Subject to the recommended conditions, the development was considered to accord with the relevant policies of Future Wales, Planning Policy Wales and the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 and was therefore recommended for approval.

Members who were familiar with the site noted that since it had been cleared of monoculture forestry in the 1990s, the site had regenerated into a biodiverse conservation area. They considered that the addition of hardstanding would assist with management of the site. The recommendation of approval was proposed by Dr Havard, seconded by Ms Gwenllian and carried at the vote.

Decision: That the application be approved, subject to conditions in respect of the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, planting and lighting.

- (d) Reference: NP/26/0242/FUL
Proposal: Proposed PV Panels to roof over outside seating area
Location: The Shed Tea Room, Porthgain, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this application was being considered by the Development Management Committee, in accordance with the scheme of delegation because the building was owned by the National Park Authority.

The Shed Tea Room formed part of Ty Mawr, a Grade II listed large stone-built former machinery shed. The Shed had been used for retail purposes since 1999, and as a tearoom and restaurant from 2001. The building was prominently situated within Porthgain Conservation Area and lay within the identified centre boundary for Porthgain, which was a Rural Centre identified in Local Development Plan 2.

Planning permission and listed building consent were sought for the addition of photovoltaic (PV) panels to the roof of the south-western lean-to. A consideration of works requiring listed building consent was contained within the accompanying planning application (NP/26/0243) (Minute 6(e) refers). The officer noted that PV Panels were considered acceptable in national Cadw guidance where the impact on the special character and setting of listed buildings was deemed acceptable, and in this instance, the addition of panels was to a modern extension rather than to the prominent historic main roof itself.



No adverse comments had been raised by consultees, and no third-party representations had been received. The proposed scheme was considered to be appropriate in terms of size, scale and detail and in keeping with the character of the listed building, and its setting in terms of design and form. It would result in energy efficiency measures being introduced to support an existing facility within a Rural Centre. The proposal therefore complied with relevant policies contained in National and Local Development Plans and as such, the application could be supported subject to conditions.

One Member asked whether the introduction of PV panels would impact on lighting levels within the structure, and the officer replied that no additional lighting had been sought as part of the application. The recommendation of approval was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Mrs Hoss and carried at the vote.

Decision: That the application be approved subject to conditions in relation to the time of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents and planting and seeding.

- (e) Reference: NP/26/0243/LBA
Proposal: Proposed PV Panels to roof over outside seating area
Location: The Shed Tea Room, Porthgain, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this application was being considered by the Committee, in accordance with the scheme of delegation because the building was owned by the National Park Authority. The application fell within the provisions of the Listed Building Delegation Direction awarded to this Authority by the Welsh Government on 25th July 2012 (as amended).

The Shed Tea Room formed part of Ty Mawr, a Grade II listed large stone-built former machinery shed. The Shed had been used for retail purposes since 1999, and as a tearoom and restaurant from 2001. The building was prominently situated within Porthgain Conservation Area.

Listed building consent was sought for the addition of photovoltaic (PV) panels to the roof of the southwestern lean-to. A consideration of works requiring planning permission was contained within the accompanying planning application (NP/26/0242/FUL) (Minute 6(d) refers). No adverse comments had been raised by consultees, and there had been no third-party representations.

The proposed scheme was considered to be appropriate in terms of size, scale and detail and in keeping with the character of the listed building, and its setting in terms of design and form. It was also considered to



comply with the requirements of TAN 24, and Cadw's Conservation Principles. As such, the application could be supported subject to conditions, and a recommendation for approval was made. This was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Ms Gwenllian and carried at the vote.

Decision: That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to conditions in respect of the timing of the development and accordance with deposited plans and documents.

7. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 9 appeals (against planning decisions made by the Authority) that were currently lodged with the Welsh Government, and detailed which stage of the appeal process had been reached to date in every case.

It was noted that no appeal decisions had been received since the last meeting.

Noted.

The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 2 September 2026 without amendment
--