

Development Management Committee

21 May 2025

Present

Dr M Havard (Chair)

Councillor S Alderman, Councillor M Bowen, Councillor T Evans, Councillor C George, Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Mrs S Hoss, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor B Price, Councillor V Thomas, Councillor A Tinley and Councillor C Williams.

[Councillor M Bowen joined the meeting prior to consideration of the applications (minute 6)]

Officers in attendance

Ms K Attrill, (Development Management Manager), Ms K Donoghue (PCC Highways), Mr C Felgate (Solicitor), Ms E Gladstone (Strategic Policy Manager), Mr M Kent (Monitoring Officer), Ms T Macey (PCC Highways), Mrs S Morris (Director of Place and Engagement), Mr A Richards (Principal Planning Officer), Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes)

[Online meeting 10.00am – 11.25am;
11.35am – 1.00pm]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Clements and Dr R Heath-Davies.

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
NP/24/0484/FUL - Redevelopment of former motel/restaurant site for a mixed commercial & community use, including village shop/post office, bistro/restaurant and conference facilities together with new vehicular access, car	Councillors M Bowen, T Evans, S Hancock, C George, M James, B Price, S Skyrme-Blackhall, V Thomas, A Tinley, C Williams and S Alderman	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting thereon.



parking & highway
improvements,
landscaping &
biodiversity
enhancements plus
change of use of
adjacent land to provide
tourism development
comprising of up to 18
timber style holiday
lodges together with
parking & landscaping
(Amended Scheme) –
Rochgate, (Former
Hotel), Roch

NP/25/0079/FUL -
Reconstruction of shed
adjacent to chapel &
construction of ramp within
Cemetery - Pisgah Baptist
Chapel, Cresswell Quay

Councillor V Thomas

Withdrew from the
meeting while the
application was
discussed

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 9 April 2025 and 12 May 2025 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

It was noted that the list of those in attendance at the meeting on the 9 April had incorrectly indicated that they had attended in person, rather than online.

On the proposal of Councillor Hancock, seconded by Councillor Skyrme-Blackhall, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 9 April 2025 be confirmed and authenticated subject to the above amendment.

On the proposal of Councillor Thomas, seconded by Mrs James, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 12 May 2025 be confirmed and authenticated.

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/24/0638/FUL Minute 6(a) refers	The creation of one traveller site incorporating one static caravan, one touring caravan, day/utility room & ecological enhancements (partly retrospective) – Land at Froghall Yard, Moreton Lane, Saundersfoot	Helen Williams – objector Andrew Vaughan-Harries
NP/24/0484/FUL Minute 6(b) refers	Redevelopment of former motel/restaurant site for a mixed commercial & community use, including village shop/post office, bistro/restaurant and conference facilities together with new vehicular access, car parking & highway	David Smith – Supporter Michael Harries – Community Council Nick Neuman - Applicant



improvements, landscaping
& biodiversity enhancements
plus change of use of
adjacent land to provide
tourism development
comprising of up to 18
timber style holiday lodges
together with parking &
landscaping (Amended
Scheme) – Rochgate,
(Former Hotel), Roch

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/24/0638/FUL
Proposal: The creation of one traveller site incorporating one static caravan, one touring caravan, day/utility room & ecological enhancements (partly retrospective)
Location: Land at Froghall Yard, Moreton Lane, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9JG

It was reported that this application sought permission, partly in retrospect, for a traveller site. The site lay outside of, but adjacent to the settlement boundary for Saundersfoot, and was therefore classified as Countryside. Policy 7 of LDP2 'Countryside' sought to strictly control development outside the identified Centres and set out the types of development that were acceptable, in principle. Criterion (I) supported the need for a Gypsy and Traveller site in a countryside location, subject to criteria in Policy 53 ('Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Sites') of LDP2 which set out a range of criteria for assessing proposals for new sites.

The submitted information provided in the supporting statement to the application stated that the applicant was born at a Gypsy and Traveller site and was a Romany Gypsy and that his lifestyle fell within the definition of Gypsies in Paragraph 2 of Circular 005/2018.

Officers considered that whilst there was an outstanding need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in Pembrokeshire, the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2019 did not identify any specific need within the National Park. The immediate, short-term need had been met and the need over the period 2025 to 2033 was being addressed by allocations in PCC's LDP2, which was timetabled for adoption in May



2026. As such, Officers recommend that moderate weight should be attached to the level of need for a site.

It was disappointing to note that the applicants had not contacted the local planning authority prior to the purchase of the site in accordance with best practice. Aerial photographs of the site showed it to have dense vegetation and the supporting statement accompanying the application stated that the applicant had purchased the application site in October 2023 and had removed a large amount of vegetation. An Enforcement Notice issued in September 2024 required the restoration of the site to its former condition recognising that the vegetation clearance had landscape and potential biodiversity impacts. An appeal against the Notice was dismissed and the Enforcement case remained open.

Officers considered that the development of a traveller site incorporating one static caravan, one touring caravan, day/utility room in a Landscape Character Area which had no further capacity to accommodate new caravan development would have an unacceptable landscape impact on the National Park particularly to walkers of the Public Right of Way. Officers also considered that the site clearance which had already taken place would result in a form of development which failed to harmonise with, or enhance, the landform and landscape character of the National Park. The development which had already taken place may also have resulted in harm to biodiversity and habitats but there was insufficient information to assess whether it would be possible to mitigate this and to deliver appropriate site enhancements. The proposal overall was therefore contrary to Policies 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), 8 (Special Qualities), 14 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) and 41 (Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development) of LDP2.

The report therefore recommended refusal of the application on the basis of landscape impact and potential harm through loss of habitats and inadequate Green Infrastructure provision. The lack of wider landscape capacity to accommodate further caravan development in this Landscape Character Area also constituted a reason for refusal.

It was noted that a significant number of representations had been received together with a petition carrying approx. 300 names, and the concerns / objections within the representations received were summarised, and where material, discussed in the report.

It was reported at the meeting that a Committee Site Visit had been undertaken (minute 3 refers). Additional information had also been provided since writing the report including a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA), amended site plan, details of additional planting and



location of trees. The PEA had been sent to Natural Resources Wales, together with a Habitats Regulations Assessment prepared by the Authority's Ecologist, as the site had a hydrological connection to a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), however no response had been received to date. The Ecologist considered that there was insufficient evidence to identify that there had been no significant impact on otters and the PEA did not provide further information. She had therefore concluded that further surveys were required.

With regards to the revised landscape plan which had been submitted, the officer reported that this offered additional land within the applicant's ownership for mitigation. However as there was no baseline information for the site, officers considered that offering land that had been cleared of scrub back as mitigation did not provide a net benefit. The revised plan also provided insufficient information to mitigate the impact on the landscape character and the two reasons for refusal set out in the report remained.

In response to a question from a Member it was clarified that in this instance there was no difference in the impact of a static or touring caravan on the LCA as it was still developed land. Also that although the access road was within a flood risk zone 3, the Highway Authority had not objected on the grounds of access for emergency vehicles but had asked for a swept path analysis. This had not been sought from the applicant due to the recommendation of refusal.

The first of two speakers was Helen Williams, speaking on behalf of the residents of Incline Way. Ms Williams drew Members' attention to the Pegasus planning report commissioned by the residents and noted that several residents had submitted objections to the plans. She began by questioning the need for a gypsy traveller site, as the applicant was from outside of the county; if there was such a need she believed that it should be located outside of the National Park and noted that there was an established site in neighbouring Kilgetty. She also noted that there had been no caravans on the site since 1993. Ms Williams pointed out that all of the dwellings overlooking the site had large windows looking down on it from above and suggested that this would not be affected by landscaping. Turning to the impact on the character and visual amenity of the area, it was noted that the development had been facilitated by the removal of trees from the site in the last 12 months, and their replacement with hardstanding, with photographic evidence to show this. This had an impact on biodiversity, particularly as the land was cleared in March during the nesting season. The result was an urbanising of a previously unspoiled woodland. Attention was also drawn to the two previously refused planning applications and the appeal that had been dismissed, all stating that any development would intrude into the open setting beyond



the village and spoil the rural character of the area. She considered that the site formed an important part of the landscape setting of the village and was of nature conservation importance and should therefore be protected from inappropriate development. It was also noted that the site was outside the residential settlement limits. Ms Williams also drew attention to ecological impacts, particularly in respect of otters and badgers, and believed that the site provided a wildlife corridor which had now been destroyed. She also questioned the appropriateness of the water and sewerage connections to the site as an incorrect postcode had been used on the application which may have misled Welsh Water. In response to a question from a Member, Ms Williams confirmed that the caravan was not inhabited but that the applicant had been in residence the night before the site visit.

The officer provided some clarification for the Committee, noting that in Circular 005/2018 there was no requirement for a local connection. Also that plans were provided to Welsh Water, accompanied by a grid reference, not just the postcode and that the agent was aware that a connection to the high pressure water main was not possible and would explore an alternative solution if planning permission was granted.

The second speaker was the Agent, Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries. He explained that full information regarding biodiversity had not been submitted with the application due to the need to submit it quickly because of the impending enforcement action. However a preliminary ecological appraisal had been submitted and some work had been done to identify biodiversity gain. He explained that he had asked for the application to be deferred to allow this to be explored further, however this had not been acceded to by officers. Nevertheless this element remained unresolved and his client was likely to appeal/re-submit an application in due course if the application was refused. Turning to the need for gypsy traveller sites within the county, Mr Vaughan-Harries noted that despite having a gypsy policy for 25 years, the Authority had not delivered one site in that time. There was one site within the National Park which had been granted under a Certificate of Lawfulness. He questioned whether Pembrokeshire County Council would be able to deliver the sites identified in its Development Plan in a timely manner and therefore private sites would be needed in the meantime. He believed that the site before the Committee would be a suitable site due to its proximity to settlement limits, access, proximity to services and evidence of previous development and noted that the applicant currently lived in bricks and mortar and wanted to return to the gypsy traveller lifestyle of caravan living.

One of the Members questioned that there had ever been residential use on the site, and the Agent advised that caravans had been positioned on



the site in the 1990s against which enforcement action had been taken and there were remnants of a dwelling. The officer confirmed that there was reference in a report from 1972 that the site contained ruins of a cottage which were no higher than 2.5 feet. It concluded that the use had been abandoned and was not a factor to be considered in the appeal at that time.

The Strategic Policy Manager reminded Members of the need identified in the GTAA and the provision in Pembrokeshire County Council's Deposit LDP2. She noted that this was due to be submitted for examination in June 2025 and the Inspector would examine the deliverability of sites.

While Members agreed that more needed to be done in Pembrokeshire to support the needs of the gypsy traveller community, they did not consider that this was the right location for a site, referencing the state of the bridleway and the flooding issue. It was noted that clearance of the site had changed the landscape character and caused a loss of biodiversity which was of concern. A recommendation of refusal was proposed by Councillor Williams and seconded by Dr Plummer.

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

- 1. The proposed development is considered to result in unacceptable landscape impacts to the National Park resulting in a development which fails to harmonise with, or enhance the landform and landscape character of the National Park. There is also a lack of information on whether the proposal will unacceptably disturb species and habitats within the countryside. The site is therefore not considered suitable for the development, contrary to the provisions of criterion d) and f) of Policy 53 (Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Sites) of LDP2. The proposal would not be compatible with the National Park Purpose of conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park and would not protect the Special Qualities of the National Park or its landscape. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policy 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), Policy 8 (Special Qualities), Policy 14 (Conservation and Enhancement of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) and Policy 30 (Amenity).**
- 2. The proposal would introduce caravan development in an area of the National Park without landscape capacity, resulting in unacceptable cumulative impacts contrary to Policy 41 Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development and the adopted Caravan, Camping and Chalet Supplementary Planning Guidance.**

[The meeting was adjourned between 11.25am and 11.35am]



[Members appointed by Pembrokeshire County Council declared a personal, but not prejudicial, interest in the following application as the applicant was known to them, but remained in the meeting and played a full part in the deliberations and voting]

- (b) Reference: NP/24/0484/FUL
Proposal: Redevelopment of former motel/restaurant site for a mixed commercial & community use, including village shop/post office, bistro/restaurant and conference facilities together with new vehicular access, car parking & highway improvements, landscaping & biodiversity enhancements plus change of use of adjacent land to provide tourism development comprising of up to 18 timber style holiday lodges together with parking & landscaping (Amended Scheme)
Location: Rochgate, (Former Hotel), Roch

It was reported that this application was originally received in September 2024. During the course of the application amended plans had been received reducing the number of lodges from 25 to 18 and removing previously included industrial units from the scheme. The amendments also added further landscaping and biodiversity enhancement in the form of a wild meadow. These changes had reduced the overall landscape impact of the scheme and resulted in a smaller land area on greenfield land being used alongside the redevelopment of the site of the former Roch Gate Motel.

It was acknowledged that the proposal would result in some visual and landscape impact on the National Park and Natural Resources Wales (NRW) had raised concerns and objected to the proposal based on the landscape and visual impact information available at the time of writing the report. The proposal however was recognised as bringing significant benefits in terms of removing a building which was causing harm to the National Park landscape at present, given its significant dilapidation and disrepair. The proposal was also recognised as delivering both economic and community benefits, including as part of its provision a local shop and post office presence in a settlement which currently did not have this service.

The significant landscaping proposed, together with biodiversity enhancements were welcomed and would assist in assimilating the scheme into the landscape. This, together with the design, meant that whilst there was considered likely to be some additional visual intrusion from the development it was not such that it would cause an unacceptable



adverse effect on the landscape of the National Park or its special qualities.

Subject to appropriate conditions including a phasing condition, conditions to control the use of the lodges and managerial accommodation, the proposal was considered acceptable in terms of matters of highways access, biodiversity, drainage and public amenity. As such, the scheme was recommended for conditional approval.

The application was reported to the Committee as the proposal constituted major development to which objections had been received. The proposal was also considered to be a departure from policies 57 (Town and District Shopping Centres) and 41 (Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development) of the Local Development Plan 2 and had been advertised as such. It was noted that a significant volume of representations had been received from third parties and these were summarised in the report; the vast majority of the respondents were supportive of the development proposal.

It was reported at the meeting that the agent for the application had proposed amending condition 21 to enable later opening until 12:00 a.m rather than 10:00 p.m on weekdays. Given the distance from other residential properties and the separation generated by the road this was considered acceptable. An additional condition was also proposed in respect of the colour of the lodges which should be grey in perpetuity to minimise the landscape impact.

It was noted that the lodges fell within the legal definition of a caravan, and the Landscape Capacity Assessment for St Brides Bay had concluded that capacity was limited to small static sites back from the coast. The applicant had submitted a landscape and visual impact assessment, providing 9 viewpoints and these were shown to the Committee. NRW had concerns that annotations on the viewpoint photographs underestimated the extent of lodge development and requested additional photo montages and photo wires from two of the viewpoints and would maintain their objection unless these were received. However officers considered that as the number of lodges had been reduced, and a 15m wide woodland belt provided, this would provide screening from day 1 and once established would considerably screen the site. Landscaping conditions were included in the report before the Committee. There would also be significant enhancement from another viewpoint due to removal of the current derelict buildings.

One Member asked about the departure from policy 57 (Town and District shopping centres) and the viability of the community shop, noting that the village shop and post office had closed. The Director advised that the



lodges would enhance the viability of the shop and various conditions had been suggested to control the retail element. In response to a question about dark skies, it was noted that there was a lighting condition and dark skies could be referred to as part of the reason.

Another Member noted the strong objection from NRW and the Director agreed that it was not comfortable to go against the nature body for Wales, however officers had looked at the site as a whole and had weighed up other material considerations such as the previously developed land and community benefits. These together with the amended scheme that reduced the amount of greenfield land and the added landscaping had led to the recommendation of approval.

Finally a Member asked about the quality of the agricultural land that would be lost and was advised that it was not classified as Best and most Versatile.

The first of three speakers was David Smith who was supporting the application. He considered that the former motel disgraced the village as the decaying building did not make a good impression as the entrance to the National Park. He explained that he was former Chair of the Community Council, former Chair of the Village Hall Committee and current Chair of the Nolton and Roch Community Land Trust and was therefore reasonably in touch with the views of the community. However in order to obtain a more quantitative assessment of local opinion he had undertaken an ad hoc survey of local residents via the village WhatsApp group and although he recognised that this was a small snapshot, he had received 129 supportive comments in 4 days, and reported that people were enthusiastic to see the new development. Mr Smith noted that two previous attempts at redeveloping the site had been abandoned for commercial reasons, however local people were keen to see the eyesore removed and a shop and post office reinstated. He added that the current scheme was proposed by a local landowner who was highly respected in the village. He believed that the bistro would provide somewhere for people to meet for coffee and would provide much needed local employment. Overall the development would enhance the convenience and well being of local residents as well as attracting visitors to spend money in local pubs and facilities. He hoped it would receive the support of the Committee.

The second speaker was Michael Harries, speaking on behalf of the Community Council which fully supported the development. He noted that since closure of the motel, the village had been tarnished by the site which was an eyesore. He found it frustrating that NRW could not see the benefits of redeveloping this blot on the landscape, having seen the viewpoints and the significant benefits that the new development would



offer. Referring to the previous applications on the site, he noted that these would have brought benefits but that the current application would provide both a significant visual improvement and a central point for the community. While Roch benefitted from a pub, hall and castle, it lacked a shop and café and the Community Council believed that The Gate would become a daily hub for locals and visitors to the area, providing valuable facilities. They thanked the applicant for persevering with the application and were delighted to see the officer recommendation of approval, being keen and excited to see the project progress. Mr Harries believed that Mr Smith's survey was matched by the high volume of correspondence received by the Authority in support of the application. He asked the Committee to support the project which would allow the applicant to improve the village and residents to be proud of the development and the economic and biodiversity benefits it would provide.

The final speaker was the applicant, Mr Nick Neuman, business owner and farmer. He noted that Rochgate was a gateway that was famous for the wrong reasons – as a blot on the landscape that had been empty for 20 years and continued to deteriorate. The site was a former WW2 radar station, that was very popular as a motel, opening in the early 1960s and closing eventually in 2008. He said it was an institution and he hoped it would become so again. He explained that he had worked with officers to develop a proposal that would complement policy and be viable for a developer; he thanked them for their tenacity and support though what had been a lengthy process given the amount of survey and supporting information required.

Mr Neuman explained that "The Gate" was the gateway to the St Davids peninsular and the proposal was for a restaurant, shop, events base and modest tourist development a stones throw from Newgale. The proposal would bring a significant multi-million pound investment to the community, create 18 full time jobs and restore lost community provision as well as revitalisation of a brownfield site. There had been a thorough pre-application consultation and inclusive community engagement events to create a scheme that delivered for all. The positive support from the community had been overwhelming

He explained that the proposal included a comprehensive green infrastructure statement and landscaping plans to offset the impacts of the development. The scheme included conversion of productive pasture into wildlife meadows and planting of a woodland belt that surrounded the whole site which over time would mitigate the visual impact on the landscape. The site had good public transport connections, established cycle routes and public rights of way to the coast. In accordance with PCC highways recommendations a new access point would be established and a new pedestrian crossing to allow safe



passage to the village. Design elements of the hub building had been adapted to better reflect the Pembrokeshire vernacular and the proposal would deliver a vibrant attractive addition to the street scene of Roch which he believed would add to the quality of the National Park. He added that in principal funding had been agreed including grant funding from Visit Wales and it was his intention to start the development as soon as conditions were discharged and in accordance with the phasing plan. He stated that he fully supported the proposed conditions and asked the Committee to consider the positive social and economic merits of the proposal before them.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr Neuman replied that the shop would be a commercial enterprise promoting local produce in the style of a farm shop. He noted that he had started the conversation with the post office regarding provision on site, but noted it would not operate five days per week. The WC provision would be for patrons/users of the facilities and not open the public.

Members were delighted to see the community, economic and biodiversity benefit that would result from the development and hoped that discussion with the post office were fruitful and such a facility would be a huge benefit to the community, as would the jobs that would be created. Some concern was expressed regarding the pedestrian crossing on what was a fast, well-used road, however Toni Macey from Pembrokeshire County Council Highway department confirmed that she was happy as there was sufficient forward visibility to see pedestrians from a distance and a safe refuge in the centre. She expected vehicles to travel in accordance with the 40mph speed limit. The recommendation of approval was moved by Councillor Dr Hancock, seconded by Councillor Skyrme-Blackhall. They confirmed that this included the amendment to condition 21 regarding additional opening hours, reference to dark skies in condition 9 and additional condition 25 in respect of colouring and materials for the lodges.

Decision: That the application be approved subject to conditions regarding the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, phasing plan, written scheme of archaeological investigation, surface water drainage, Construction Environmental Management Plan, hours of working during demolition and construction, noise, lighting, drainage, Construction Traffic Management Plan, pedestrian safety, access, visibility splays, parking, tree protection, landscaping, restriction of the lodges for holiday letting, managers accommodation, hours of opening of the Bistro, protection of nearby retail centres and agreement for materials of The Gate and Lodges.



[Councillor Williams tendered his apologies and left the meeting.
Councillor Thomas disclosed an interest in the following application and withdrew from the meeting while it was considered]

- (c) Reference: NP/25/0079/FUL
Proposal: Reconstruction of shed adjacent to chapel & construction of ramp within cemetery
Location: Pisgah Baptist Chapel, Cresswell Quay, Cresselly,

It was reported that the application related to the construction of an accessibility ramp between the original cemetery and the new cemetery, and a replacement shed for maintenance equipment within the Chapel grounds.

The application was considered acceptable in terms of scale, design and need and was presented to the Development Management Committee as the applicant was an employee of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority. It was noted that the chapel and its grounds were located within the recently designated Cresswell Quay Conservation Area, with the south boundary marking the edge of this conservation area. However the ramp was not considered to have a significant impact on the Conservation Area and would contribute towards meeting the public sector equality duty by assisting in improving opportunities for disabled people to access services and facilities. The recommendation was therefore one of approval. This was proposed by Dr Plummer, seconded by Councillor James and carried.

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

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.

Two appeal decisions were reported in respect of NP/24/0505/FUL - First floor extension, insertion of rooflights and additional glazing to the front elevation at 15 Scandinavia Heights, Saundersfoot; and NP/23/0438/FUL Proposed 2 & 1/2 Storey 3-bedroom dwelling with integral garage and associated external works - Westfields, Wisemans Bridge both of which were dismissed. The Development Management Manager apologised that the second appeal decision had not been appended to the report.

Noted.



8. Thanks

The Chair noted that this would be the final meeting for Dr R Heath-Davies and Mrs J James, whose terms of office with the National Park Authority came to an end on 31 May. She thanked them for their sterling service and input to the Committee over the previous eight years.

The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 9 July 2025 without amendment

