

Development Management Committee

22 April 2026

Present (In Person)

Councillor Dr SL Hancock (Chair)

Miss F Day, Councillor T Evans, Dr M Havard, Mr J Hogg, Mr GA Jones, Councillor V Thomas, Councillor A Tinley, Councillor C Williams and Councillor M Williams.

Present (Remotely)

Councillor D Clements, Councillor C George, Ms H Gwenllian, Mrs S Hoss, Councillor M James, Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall, Councillor B Price,

[Councillor M Bowen joined the meeting during consideration of NP/25/0616/FUL (Minute 6(a) refers)]

Officers in attendance

Ms K Attrill, (Development Management Manager), Ms C Broome, Mr C Felgate (Solicitor), Ms B Gledhill (Planning Officer), Mr M Kent (Monitoring Officer), Mrs S Morris (Director of Place and Engagement), Mrs C Llewellyn and Miss G Jones (Minutes)

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock and Virtually 10.00am – 11.20am;
11.30am - 12.30pm]

1. Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

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
Minutes 6(c) below NP/21/0720/FUL - Demolition of existing garage and division of rear garden to provide a plot for a new three- bedroom dwelling – Manor House, 14 Grove Place, Little Haven	Councillor T Evans	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions



Minute 7 EC23/0048 -
Breach of Planning
Permission
NP/19/0522/FUL re
affordable housing and
non-discharge of
conditions - Buttyland
Caravan & Camping
Park, Manorbier, Tenby,
SA70 7SX

Councillor Dr S
Hancock

Withdrew from the
meeting while the
application was
discussed

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 11 March 2026 were presented for confirmation and signature.

On the proposal of Councillor Dr Hancock, seconded by Councillor Clements, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 11 March 2026 be confirmed and signed.

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/25/0616/ FUL Minute 6(a) refers	Proposed rural enterprise dwelling, track extension, foul drainage system and associated works - Eithin Farm, Felindre Farchog	Adam and Dee - applicants
NP/25/0293/ FUL Minute 6(b) refers	Ancillary accommodation in rear garden – Cwmderi, Llanrhian, Haverfordwest,	Cllr Neil Prior – County Councillor Amanda John - Applicant
NP/21/0720/ FUL Minute 6(c) refers	Demolition of existing garage and division of rear garden to provide a plot for a new three-bedroom dwelling - Manor House, 14 Grove Place, Little Haven	Michael Hughes - applicant

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/25/0616/FUL
	Proposal:	Proposed rural enterprise dwelling, track extension, foul drainage system and associated works
	Location:	Eithin Farm, Felindre Farchog, Crymych, SA41 3XW

It was reported that this application sought consent for a rural enterprise dwelling, a track extension, private foul drainage system and associated works. A rural enterprise dwelling appraisal had been received with the application which set out the reasons for the requirement for the dwelling. The applicants currently ran a successful horticultural business, which



continued to grow, with more demand for produce. The Authority had consulted its Agricultural Advisor in relation to whether the information submitted was sufficient to pass the tests set out in Technical Advice Note 6 – Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities. It was deemed that the proposal satisfied the tests, and that there was a genuine need for the dwelling. It was considered that the siting of the dwelling was acceptable. It was to be located on Grade 3b Best and Most Versatile Agricultural land, and as such, there would be no loss of the highest graded land (Grades 1, 2 and 3A).

An objection had been received from the Community Council which stated that the proposed site should be closer to the sheds, and that the area designated for future seasonal agricultural workers (as shown on the Appendix Master Plan) would be more appropriate for a dwelling. It was for this reason that the application was before the Committee. Other public responses had been received and these were summarised in the report.

It was not considered that the proposed development would harm the special qualities of this area of the National Park, and the siting and design of the dwelling were considered acceptable with no concerns in relation to landscape impact, amenity or biodiversity. Overall, the proposal was deemed to be in accordance with local and national planning policy and guidance. A recommendation to grant permission was made, subject to suitably worded conditions.

It was noted at the meeting that the red line shown in the report pack was inaccurate, however the correct line was shown on the proposed site plan and highlighted on the screen.

The applicants, Adam and Dee, then addressed the Committee. Dee first explained that the business was heading into its fifth season and was thriving, employing 14 people including themselves, providing produce for schools and restaurants. Diversity was important to them, with over 250 varieties of 75 crops. They had planted thousands of native species of trees as well as creating ponds and wetlands. In recognition, the business had been shortlisted for Young Organic Farmer of the Year as well as being a Mentor and training provider with the Welsh Farming Advisory Service.

Adam continued that they were scaling up production as demand was growing, as was their family, and to safeguard the future they needed to live on site. They currently had a 20-minute commute, but this was unsustainable and put a strain on family life. Days could be long, with some flowers needing to be picked at dawn, while poly tunnels needed to be opened early and closed late during the summer. In winter there could



be difficulties getting to the farm, with there being a risk to life by driving in storms, for example when there was damage to one of the poly tunnels which needed to be secured before the structure was damaged beyond repair. Levels of risk were high and although automatic systems were in use, they could not always be relied upon. He added that the proposed dwelling was simple, cheap and energy efficient. Its location to the north of the site retained the best south facing fields for crops. The site suggested by the Community Council was currently planted as an orchard and was better land. The proposed location was also away from the busy yard and entrance and therefore safer for their young family.

Dee concluded that living away from the site was a limiting factor to the viability of the business and hoped that the Committee would support the officer recommendation to enable the enterprise to prosper in the future and participate in local initiatives that helped protect food security in Wales.

The applicants confirmed that the accommodation was solely for the family and that other employees would continue to travel or live elsewhere on site if seasonal workers were required in future. Another Member asked about their plans for the next five years and the applicants replied that they were currently unable to meet the demand and were renting more land which was adjacent to the site and extending the sales season year-round. They hoped to strengthen links with local suppliers and continue to work with the public sector to make local organic produce more accessible for schools. They currently employed 4-5 people plus themselves over the winter with 12 people employed during the growing season. They anticipated that this number would increase in future.

Members were content with the assurances from officers regarding the need for the development and its positioning within the site and commended the applicants for their achievements to date. The recommendation of approval was proposed by Dr Harvard, seconded by Councillor Clements and carried.

Decision: That the application be approved subject to conditions in relation to the timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, foul drainage, planting, lighting, ecology, tree protection, occupancy of the dwelling, finishes, restriction of permitted development and under grounding of cables.



(b)	Reference:	NP/25/0293/FUL
	Proposal:	Ancillary accommodation in rear garden
	Location:	Cwmderi, Llanrhian, Haverfordwest, SA62 5BH

This application for an annexe building in the rear garden of the main dwelling was recommended for approval. Whilst the proposal was considered to be a departure to the Local Development Plan 2 (Policy 7 Countryside) because the proposed development sat outside the existing curtilage of the dwelling, there were a number of material considerations which were considered to outweigh that technical departure and the proposal was considered to comply with the aims of LDP2 as a whole. A particular material consideration in this case was that the site benefitted from an extant consent for a similar annexe in a similar position. The current proposed development also demonstrated a sufficient degree of inter-connectedness through its occupation by a family member to fulfil caring needs, with the controls delivered by an accompanying Section 106 legal agreement ensuring that the annexe and the main dwelling remained as one planning unit. Planning conditions would also ensure that the property could not be used for holiday letting or for any separate commercial letting use. The overall siting of the proposal was considered acceptable. Due to the loss of an unknown number of trees, the proposed green infrastructure was unclear at this stage, and an attached condition required further information to be submitted. Following consultation, no objections had been received from statutory consultees, or from third parties.

Therefore the proposed scheme was considered acceptable in how it responded to landscape setting, visual, aesthetic and physical characteristics of the site and preserved the character of the main dwelling. The accompanying Section 106 legal agreement and proposed conditions would ensure that the annexe building, and main dwelling would remain as one residential unit and could not be let independently of the main dwelling. It was not considered that the development would cause an unacceptable impact upon privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties. Ecology and landscape features would not be adversely affected by the development. Overall, the special qualities of the National Park would be conserved.

In response to Members' questions, the officer clarified that the existing consent was capable of being implemented, however the applicant had chosen to submit the current application to avoid the expense of moving an electricity pole. They also confirmed that the recommendation was not subject to receipt of a S106 Agreement as a final agreement had already been received.



The first speaker was Councillor Neil Prior, the County Councillor for the area, speaking in support of the application. He recognised that the application departed from policy, but considered that other material factors weighed in favour of approval, particularly the fall-back position of the existing permission. He believed that the need for the development was genuine and compelling and appropriate safeguards in the form of a S106 agreement and conditions had been put in place to address concerns regarding future misuse of the dwelling. He also considered the scale to be appropriate and that there would be no landscape impact. He asked the Committee to apply policy with judgement and asked that they support the officer recommendation.

The second speaker was the applicant, Amanda John. She explained that she was born and raised in the area and wished to remain living in the local community. However this had been a challenge due to the cost of property and the high number of second homes. Furthermore, due to the medical needs of a family member she had been living separately from her partner as living together nearby had not been possible. She had no wish to create a separate dwelling or to use the proposed property commercially.

Members considered this to be a well worked-out application that had little landscape impact and were content with the material reasons for the policy departure based on the extant permission. The recommendation of approval was moved by Councillor Hancock, seconded by Councillor C Williams and carried.

Decision: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, landscaping scheme, finishes, no enclosure of the annex building, biodiversity enhancement scheme, external lighting, no independent use of the annexe building and no separate parking.

[The Committee was adjourned between 11.20am and 11.30am]

[Councillor Price tendered her apologies and left the meeting during consideration of the following application.]



(c)	Reference:	NP/21/0720/FUL
	Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage and division of rear garden to provide a plot for a new three-bedroom dwelling
	Location:	Manor House, 14 Grove Place, Little Haven, Haverfordwest, SA62 3UG

It was reported that this application had been brought to the Committee in September 2022 and was approved subject to the receipt of an acceptable S106 agreement to provide for a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing. Neither a challenge on viability grounds nor a suitably signed S106 agreement had been provided to date. Whilst the original report referenced a signed S106, subsequent checks indicated a key party had not signed the agreement. The standard approach of the Authority when requesting delegated powers to approve was to also request delegation to refuse if the S106 was not received within three months, but in this instance that was not included in the original report.

Whilst Officers of the Authority were sympathetic to the circumstances of the applicants who had been trying to resolve an issue with a charge on the land, the Authority could not hold applications live indefinitely and the current application had been with the Authority for a number of years.

Based on there being no mechanism to secure the affordable housing contribution required under Policy 48 (Affordable Housing) and the SPG on Affordable Housing, the application was considered contrary to the requirements of Policy 48 (Affordable Housing) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 and could not be supported. The recommendation was one of refusal.

There was one speaker, the applicant Michael Hughes. He explained that for business reasons, he had legally separated his house from his garden and had subsequently applied for planning permission for a house in the garden to which he hoped to retire. He apologised for the lack of communication; however his wife had been seriously unwell. Nevertheless, he had repeatedly approached Barclays bank, which had a charge on the garden, however they had refused to sign the agreement as they saw no reason to do so. He offered to find an alternative way to fulfil the Undertaking, including payment of the required sum of money.

The Authority's Solicitor advised that the Authority could not grant permission without a signed S106 Agreement and noted that the alternatives put forward were not acceptable. He suggested that Mr Hughes obtain legal advice before submitting a fresh application. The Director of Place and Engagement noted that if planning permission was



refused the applicant was entitled to re-submit the application for free within 12 months.

While Members were sympathetic to the applicant's predicament, their responsibility was to determine applications in accordance with due process and the officer recommendation of refusal was moved by Dr Harvard, seconded by Councillor Clements, and carried.

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

- 1. The application is contrary to Policy 48 (Affordable Housing) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 due to there being no mechanism to secure the required affordable housing provision. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy 48 (Affordable Housing) of the Local Development Plan 2, the SPG on affordable housing, and national planning policy contained within Planning Policy Wales (edition 12).**

[Councillor Dr Hancock had declared a prejudicial interest in the following matter and withdrew from the meeting. The Deputy Chair, Councillor V Thomas took the Chair.]

- 7. EC23/0048 - Breach of Planning Permission NP/19/0522/FUL re affordable housing and non-discharge of conditions - Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier, Tenby, SA70 7SX**

It was reported that in June 2021 an appeal had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate granting outline/full planning permission for a hybrid application for outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for 14 affordable housing units and full planning permission for the change of use of land from 85 tents and tourers to 85 static caravans with associated landscaping, distributor roads and new sewage pumping station at Buttyland Caravan and Camping Park, Station Road, Manorbier, Tenby, SA70 7SN in accordance with the terms of application NP/19/0522/FUL dated 25 September 2019. This followed a previous refusal by the Authority's Development Management Committee.

The permission was granted subject to a number of planning conditions and also to submission of a completed Section 106 legal agreement which was entered into by the appellant during the course of the appeal.

The terms of the Section 106 legal agreement related to the transfer of land to the local housing authority or registered social landlord for the provision of the affordable housing element of the proposal, before any development commenced. It also included provisions concerning



ecological and landscaping management works and an associated management agreement.

Since May 2023, officers had been in communication with the owner identifying that development appeared to have commenced without the discharge a number of pre-commencement conditions and also that the site was in breach of the terms of the Section 106 agreement in respect of the transfer of the Affordable Housing Land. By May 2025, site visits showed that 17 caravans had been installed with 16 occupied and one used as a showroom. At that stage, the Authority had issued a Requisition for Information pursuant to section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to the owner.

The relevant pre-commencement conditions on site had all now been discharged, and it was noted at the meeting that a copy of the requisition for information had now been received. It was therefore recommended that criminal prosecution in regard to failure to comply with the requisition for information should not be progressed.

The Authority had also received correspondence from the solicitor acting for the site owner explaining that a transfer of land to an affordable housing provider was imminent and asking that no further action be taken as good progress was now being made on matters in the section 106 agreement.

However officers considered that there were still several fundamental breaches persisting, the main of these being that the affordable housing land has not been transferred despite assurances, but there were others. Officers clarified that any progress being made on the exchange of contracts regarding the affordable housing land appeared to be on a conditional basis, with no clear information available as to when conditions in any contract might be fulfilled, if at all. The sewage pumping station required by the legal agreement had not been installed and the SUDS work has not been implemented nor the ecological and landscaping details.

There was therefore a need for injunction proceedings to be issued until the land transfer to a registered social landlord had taken place and Members were asked to approve the second and third recommendations.

The Solicitor clarified that he didn't believe that the trigger had been reached in relation to the sewage pumping station and therefore there was no basis to proceed with injunction proceedings in that regard, but there were other breaches including the affordable housing land, SUDS requirements and the landscape and ecology management matters, which would justify an injunction application. .



A number of Members could recall the application when it first came before the Committee and were disappointed that work had taken place without compliance with the necessary Section 106 requirements. The amended recommendations were proposed by Dr Havard, seconded by Councillor Clements, and carried.

It was **resolved** that

1. Delegated authority be given to the Director of Place and Engagement to instruct solicitors to commence injunction proceedings in relation to the ongoing failure to comply with the Section 106 agreement.
2. Delegated Authority be given to the Director of Place and Engagement to make all necessary decisions in relation to the conduct of such injunction proceedings

[Councillor Hancock returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair]

8. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 10 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.

Appeal decisions were reported in respect of NP/24/0612/FUL Conversion of residential flat and former Public House to one residential dwelling - Taberna, Herbrandston, Milford Haven, which was dismissed and NP/25/0271/FUL Erection of wooden fence along part of the back garden of property (retrospective) - 34, Maes Y Cnwce, Newport, which was allowed. The Development Management Manager noted that with regard to the latter appeal that officers would carefully consider the time given for temporary consents in future as well as the reasoning provided for the temporary nature of such consents.

Noted.

The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 3 June 2026 without amendment

