

Development Management Committee

28 January 2026

Present (In Person)

Councillor Dr SL Hancock (Chair)

Councillor S Alderman, Councillor T Evans, Councillor C George, Dr M Havard, Mr J Hogg, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor V Thomas, Councillor A Tinley and Councillor C Williams.

Present (Remotely)

Councillor D Clements, Ms H Gwenllian, Mrs S Hoss, Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall

[Councillor M Bowen joined the meeting prior to consideration of item 3 – minutes]

Officers in attendance

Ms K Attrill, (Development Management Manager), Mr C Felgate (Solicitor), Mrs S Morris (Director of Place and Engagement), Mr A Richards (Principal Planning Officer), Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes)

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock and Virtually 10.00am – 11.45am;
12.05am - 1.00pm]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Mr M Kent (Monitoring Officer) 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(a) below NP/25/0536/FUL The creation of one traveller site incorporating one static caravan, one touring caravan, one day/utility room & ecological enhancements & woodland creation on surrounding land (partly retrospective) – Land at	Councillor V Thomas	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed



Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
Froghall Yard, Moreton Lane, Saundersfoot		
Minute 6(c) below NP/25/0569/FUL - Change of use of the ground floor area of the existing Coastal Schooner Interpretation Centre (F1) to a mix of indoor visitor attraction (D2) and Interpretation Centre (F1) - The Coastal Schooner, The Harbour, Saundersfoot	Councillor C Williams	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 3 December 2025 were presented for confirmation and signature.

On the proposal of Councillor Hancock, seconded by Councillor Alderman, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 3 December 2025 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, 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. The Solicitor drew attention to the section on human rights and the importance that Members should place on that, in light of the protected characteristics evident in one of the applications on the agenda. Finally, the Solicitor added that although the report did not mention this, that the Authority's decisions could be 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/25/0536/FUL Minute 6(a) refers	The creation of one traveller site incorporating one static caravan, one touring caravan, one day/utility room & ecological enhancements & woodland creation on surrounding land (partly retrospective) – Land at Froghall Yard, Moreton Lane, Saundersfoot	Helen Williams – Objector Lynne Garnett – Senior Practitioner – Travelling Ahead Community Planning Project Coordinator – Supporter Andrew Vaughan-Harries – Agent

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*):

[Having disclosed a prejudicial interest in the following application, Councillor V Thomas left the room during consideration of the following application]



- (a) Reference: NP/25/0536/FUL
Proposal: The creation of one traveller site incorporating one static caravan, one touring caravan, one day/utility room & ecological enhancements & woodland creation on the surrounding land (partly retrospective)
Location: Land at Froghall Yard, Moreton Lane, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9JG

It was reported that this application was a resubmission of a previously refused scheme, with additional proposed ecological enhancements beyond that included previously. The site was subject to an enforcement notice and had also been visited by the Committee in May 2025. The main issues were whether the need for the additional traveller caravan site provision in the area and the circumstances of the applicant outweighed any harm caused to the character and appearance of the National Park.

The Pembrokeshire Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2019 (GTAA) had identified an immediate need for nine pitches by the end of 2024, which had been met, and there was a remaining, unmet need for 25 pitches over the period 2025 to 2033. The GTAA 2019 did not identify a specific need for pitches in the National Park, and Pembrokeshire County Council was making provision for an additional 55 pitches in its LDP 2, which had been submitted for examination.

The applicant had existing accommodation and was not currently homeless. Moderate weight had therefore been given in the report to the existing level of outstanding unmet need for Gypsy Traveller accommodation in Pembrokeshire. That level of need had to be weighed against the likely impact of development on the National Park landscape and habitat in this area.

The proposed site was within a Landscape Character Area (LCA1), which had been assessed as having no further capacity to accommodate new caravan development. The proposal comprised one static caravan and one touring caravan, together with an associated utility room, all for residential use. Officers considered that further caravan development in this LCA of any type would exceed landscape capacity and contribute to a cumulative adverse impact, and aerial photographs were shown at the meeting of the proximity of nearby caravan sites.

There had also been significant site clearance undertaken prior to the submission of the application, and the impact on the landscape, biodiversity, and ecosystem resilience had been assessed as potentially negative, with uncertainty about the definitive impact due to the lack of a baseline assessment prior to clearance.



The report recommended refusal of the application on the basis of landscape impact and potential biodiversity harm, including loss of habitats and inadequate provision of Green Infrastructure.

At the meeting, Councillor Williams advised that he had recently received a phone call during which the caller stated that the applicant was not from the Gypsy Traveller community, however he advised that he didn't express any views regarding the application to the caller. Thanking the Member for the information, officers advised that this issue was also addressed within the report as it had been raised by other third parties. The Solicitor added that the Authority was not in a position to reach a determination on the allegations and therefore the safest course of action was to determine the application based on the basis that the applicant was a member of the Gypsy Traveller community, on which information had been submitted by the applicant with the application.

Officers noted that since writing the report, the applicant and agent had submitted further information, including correspondence showing that tree removal at the site had been undertaken by previous landowners and in response to ash dieback, as well as references to similar applications determined by Bridgend County Borough Council which had been approved. This information had been circulated to the Committee and considered by officers. Whilst acknowledging some degree of tree management by previous owners, officers had reviewed the correspondence, and photographs taken in conjunction with previous enforcement investigations which showed that extensive site clearance had taken place since March 2024 when the site was in the current ownership. However the main issue was that no baseline ecological information was available from the point where the current applicant took ownership. They also considered the circumstances of the Bridgend decision to be different to the current application due to its location outside of a National Park and in an area with capacity for additional caravans.

Members were unhappy with the lack of response from certain statutory consultees and in the case of Cadw, it was suggested that a letter be written to the relevant Welsh Government Cabinet Member raising the Authority's concern. Members also asked a number of questions relating to landscape impact, drainage on the site and flooding to the access road. Officers replied that the concern was that insufficient information had been provided to assess the impact of the development on habitats and biodiversity, that SAB approval was not required and surface water drainage could be covered by condition and was not a reason for refusal, in respect of flooding; finally an alternative access was available and



access for emergency vehicles could be covered by a Grampian condition.

The first speaker was Helen Williams, speaking on behalf of residents of Incline Way, some of whose properties backed onto the site. She drew attention to a report commissioned by residents in respect of the previous application setting out why the application should be rejected and did not believe that the applicant had undertaken further mitigation since that time. She stated that there was no history of the site being lawfully used by Gypsies and Travellers and did not think that the planning applications referred to by the Agent were relevant. She noted that the site was outside of the settlement boundary and the development would have an impact on the character of the area and its visual amenity. With regard to the clearance of trees and scrub, she stated that only 3 trees had been removed as a result of Ash Dieback and that clearance by previous owners had been minimal; she referred to photographs in the commissioned report which she said showed the devastating impact to the character of the site, habitat and biodiversity. She did not believe that what was proposed would mitigate that as this was more akin to managed woodland. Ms Williams referred to concerns that soakaways would drain into the stream and contribute to flooding of Moreton Lane, which was a narrow private bridleway for much of its length, and therefore safe and sustainable access could not be demonstrated. She considered that development of the site would lead to a loss of privacy, noise and light pollution. She also referred to the history of refusals at the site and the appeal that had been dismissed. She believed that the site formed an important part of the setting of the village and was important for nature conservation. She believed it was the role of the National Park Authority to conserve and enhance the area and that approving the application would be contrary to its role.

The second speaker was Lynne Garnett from Travelling Ahead, speaking in support of the application. She explained that she coordinated a Welsh Government funded project under the Anti-Racist Action Plan which was intended to help the Travelling Community to develop private sites. She stated that Local Authorities were failing in their duty by not developing adequate council sites, not engaging with the Gypsy Traveller community and not making services available to those without computers. As a result, the Community has had to buy land to develop their own sites. This was difficult due to the level of prejudice, however such small, family-owned sites could be beneficial as they encouraged integration and contact with those outside of the Community thus improving the level of understanding and tolerance.

Turning to the application before the Committee, Ms Garnett considered that the way the campaign against the site had been conducted was



concerning. She explained that she had visited the applicant in their poor-quality home and explained that he wanted to retire to land that he owned, in a community where he had previously lived and worked, having spent much of his life living in caravans. He, like many Travellers, had been forced into inappropriate accommodation. Ms Garnett compared the demand for Gypsy Traveller sites as more acute than that for social housing, with many having been on a waiting list for over 20 years. The insinuation that the applicant was not homeless demonstrated the impossible position – he hadn't given up his rented property, but had been criticised for having pulled his caravan onto the site. She stated that significant sums of money had been paid to develop the site and many travellers were unaware of the GTAA process and she therefore questioned its reliability as a determination of need. She noted that the Gypsy Traveller Community didn't consider Local Authority boundaries, but look in areas that they like, can work or are offered land by other family members. She highlighted that racism against Gypsy Travellers was a problem – anyone selling land to them were often shunned and they were therefore disadvantaged.

Finally Ms Garnett considered that the landscape impact of one mobile home could be dealt with by condition. The site was already well screened and the applicant wished to maintain this. She restated that tree removal could not be attributed solely to the applicant. She failed to see how one caravan could tip the balance in respect of saturation point for caravans. She therefore asked the Committee to reconsider and look at new ways of working with the Gypsy Traveller community and to alleviate the chronic accommodation crisis these communities were facing.

The final speaker was the Agent, Mr Andrew Vaughan-Harries. He said that he was still learning new facts about this site, referring to the new information regarding previous land clearance. He noted that Policy 53 encouraged traveller sites within the National Park, but that not one site had been delivered. He noted that the GTAA had identified need, however he considered that Pembrokeshire County Council were failing in their delivery, and despite doing their best, more sites were needed. He believed that the current site fulfilled many of the criteria of Policy 53. Referring to the officer report, he noted that the biggest concern was the ecological and landscape effect of the site, however he considered that ecological gain could be achieved. His client was only now beginning to understand about the baseline and had advised that he had not undertaken the majority of the clearance. Mr Vaughan-Harries advised that he had asked for a deferment to try to establish the ecological baseline when his client had purchased the site and to show that there was still sufficient land for enhancement and to screen the development. He concluded by saying that he thought the site provided an excellent,



well screened location, with positive responses in respect of highways and drainage from statutory consultees.

One Member stated that he had seen the applicant on site in a digger in Spring 2024 and questioned what he had been doing if he hadn't cleared any of the site. In response, Mr Vaughan-Harries didn't deny that his client had put down some hard core on a previously developed yard, and had used a digger to flatten the site and stockpile trees cleared previously, a continuation of work undertaken before he had taken ownership, as the site had been left in a mess. He stated that his client didn't cut trees down as he didn't own a chainsaw, but there was some continued clearance works. Another Member pointed out that the site was currently screened by an urban fence which was inappropriate from a landscape point of view, to which Mr Vaughan-Harries replied that he accepted that the site was in the National Park, however the application sought to improve that situation through planting and hedgebanks. Officers pointed out the proposed hedgebank on the Agent's submitted landscaping scheme.

Members acknowledged that there were some complex issues in respect of the ecological baseline, however they considered that the application was contrary to policy. They also noted that officers at Pembrokeshire County Council were currently working collaboratively with the Gypsy Traveller Community. The recommendation of refusal was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Dr Plummer. One Member expressed the view that the application should be approved on the basis of equality and diversity. When put to the vote the motion to refuse was carried.

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

1. The proposed development has resulted in unacceptable landscape impact on the National Park and potentially disturbed species and habitats within the countryside. The proposal would not be compatible with the National Park's purpose of conserving and enhancing its natural beauty, wildlife, and cultural heritage, nor would it protect its Special Qualities or its landscape. The application also fails to demonstrate a Net Benefit for Biodiversity. 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), Policy 30 (Amenity), (criteria d & f) of Policy 53 (Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople Sites) of LDP2, Section 6 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12), and the Environment (Wales) Act 2016.



2. In the absence of robust ecological evidence and given the loss of potential otter habitat, the proposal fails to demonstrate that impacts on otters and the integrity of the Carmarthen Bay and Estuaries Special Area of Conservation would be avoided. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy 10 (Sites and Species of European Importance), Policy 11 (Nationally Protected Sites and Species), and Section 6 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12), The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and the Environment (Wales) Act 2016.

3. The proposal would introduce caravan development in an area of the National Park without landscape capacity, resulting in unacceptable cumulative impacts that are contrary to Policy 41: Caravan, Camping and Chalet Development and the adopted Caravan, Camping and Chalet Supplementary Planning Guidance.

[Councillor Bowen tendered her apologies and left the meeting prior to the vote being taken on the following application.]

[The meeting was adjourned between 11.45am and 12.05pm]

- (b) Reference: NP/25/0230/FUL
Proposal: A one-bedroomed property with provision for home working
Location: Plot adjacent Delfryn, Serpentine Road, Tenby, Pembrokeshire SA70 8DD

It was reported that this application sought consent for the construction of a single storey, one bedroomed property with provision for home working. The site consisted of an empty plot on Serpentine Road, within Tenby's Centre boundary which was currently overgrown with a roofless garage towards the eastern portion of the plot.

The majority of consultees had not raised any adverse comments, however, Tenby Town Council had objected to the proposal on the grounds of over-development and the site being very constrained. One third party representation had been received and this was addressed in the report.

The design offered a contemporary approach to a small infill site which would not have a significant impact on the street scene due to its limited height and being set back behind the frontages of both adjacent dwellings. There were no issues of amenity or privacy, and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions regarding landscaping and tree



protection, no objections to the scheme had been raised by the Tree & Landscape Officer or Ecologist.

Dŵr Cymru had advised that the proposed development site was located in the catchment of a public sewerage system which drains to Tenby Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) and had confirmed that this had insufficient capacity in terms of flow passed forward (wet weather capacity). This capacity would not be provided until December 2029 and as such a condition restricting occupation until December 2029 had been suggested to ensure no environmental harm was caused as a result of this development.

As the application proposed the construction of an open market dwelling, a financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing was required in accordance with Policy 48 of the LPD2. However subject to appropriate conditions, and the contribution towards affordable housing being secured through a legal agreement, the provision of a small dwelling in this location was considered to comply with both national and local development plan policies and the recommendation was one of delegated approval.

At the meeting the officer recommended a number of additional conditions. The first was to require the development to begin no later than five years from the date of the decision; taking account of the condition restricting occupation until December 2029, this was still considered reasonable. A second condition would require details of boundary treatment to be approved by the Authority. It was also requested that condition 7 be amended by requiring a further application to be submitted should there be a desire to infill the internal courtyard, in order to ensure adequate parking provision. The officer clarified that removal of one tree required its replacement by three trees which could lead to the loss of parking.

Members expressed some concern regarding the situation at the WwTW and questioned whether a single bed property would have sufficient impact, however officers advised that such conditions were common and it was necessary to treat all applications equally and in accordance with the advice of a statutory consultee and the Authority's Section 6 Duty in respect of Biodiversity and Resilience of Ecosystems under the Environment (Wales) Act 2016. Officers also advised of the risk of cumulative impacts from a number of small sites and warned that, although their view was that condition met the required tests, the applicant may explore that on appeal, which would provide useful guidance for other applications.



Members considered the application to be an innovative use of a small plot in a low impact manner, and welcomed the provision of a 1-bed property in Tenby. The recommendation of delegated approval was proposed by Councillor Clements, seconded by Councillor Skyrme-Blackhall and carried at the vote.

Decision: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to a contribution towards affordable housing being secured through receipt of a fully signed legal agreement and subject to conditions in respect of the timing of the development and its beneficial use, accordance with approved plans and documents, access, parking, adherence to Construction Traffic Management Plan, drainage, infilling of the courtyard area, removal of permitted development rights, retention of the home office, biodiversity enhancement scheme, site clearance, landscaping, tree protection, surface water drainage and boundary treatment.

If a legal agreement was not received within 30 days of the date of the decision, delegated authority was provided to refuse the application

[Having disclosed an interest in the following application, Councillor Williams tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture]

- (c) Reference: NP/25/0569/FUL
Proposal: Change of use of the ground floor area of the existing Coastal Schooner Interpretation Centre (F1) to a mix of indoor visitor attraction (D2) and Interpretation Centre (F1)
Location: The Coastal Schooner, The Harbour, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9HE

It was reported that the application site was part of the Coastal Schooner building, which was located on the deck area over the sluice facility within Saundersfoot Harbour. The building was a replica of a traditional coastal schooner vessel, which operated from the harbour during the coal mining era to transport coal from Saundersfoot. The existing structure comprised an interpretation area within the middle section, an associated small cinema area was located within the bow area, and a café was located to the stern area with a separate access, and all this was accommodated within the hull section of the building.

The current proposal sought to provide a new use within the interpretation area to accommodate an indoor mini golf tourist attraction, with the existing interpretation information retained. No external alterations, apart from planters, were proposed as part of this application.



Officers considered that the current application for a new mixed D2 and F1 use within the existing Coastal Schooner, which would retain the interpretation centre (F1) aspect and add an indoor mini golf facility (D2), was a suitable mixed use for the existing structure located on the events deck at Saundersfoot Harbour.

The proposed works would, apart from planters, be fully contained within the existing structure and provide an indoor facility for residents and visitors, which was considered to enhance the Visitor Economy of the area, not just through the tourist season but also outside of the peak season, having scope for all year-round operation. As such, and subject to a schedule of suitable conditions to control the development, the development was considered to be acceptable and complied with the requirements of Future Wales and policies of the Local Development Plan 2.

In response to a question, the officer clarified that the upper deck of the structure would be unaffected and the existing toilet, café and lift to the upper deck would be retained. The officer also agreed that numbers using the facility would be limited by the size of the structure and that a staff member would be present whenever it was open.

Members were pleased to see that the interpretation was to be retained and that an alternative, family-friendly, use to that proposed previously had been suggested. The recommendation of approval was proposed by Dr Plummer, seconded by Councillor Hancock and carried at the vote.

Decision: That the application be approved, subject to conditions in relation to the timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, accordance with the Green Infrastructure Statement and hours of use.

7. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 8 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.

One appeal decision was reported, in respect of EC22/0038, Siting of Camping Pod and associated drainage work - Land to the north of Pentop, Abercastle, Haverfordwest, which had been partially dismissed, with one element allowed. The Head of Development Management noted that the camping pod itself had been approved as a certified site by an exempted organisation and therefore didn't require permission; details of the landscaping scheme, which was to be provided within three months,



had not yet been received. Photographs of the site including the works to be removed were shown on screen to Committee.

Noted.

8. Thanks

Chairs of the both the Development Management Committee and the Authority paid tribute to the contribution of Dr Rosie Plummmer, whose term of office as a Welsh Government appointed Member came to an end on 31 January. She would be greatly missed.

The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 11 March 2026 without amendment

