

# Development Management Committee

8 March 2023

## Present (In Person)

Dr M Havard (Chair)

Councillor R Jordan, Councillor PJ Morgan, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor Mrs S Skyrme-Blackhall, Councillor Mrs M Wiggins, and Councillor C Williams.

## Present (Remotely)

Councillor Mrs D Clements, Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs S Hoss, Councillor M James, Councillor R Owens, Councillor Mrs V Thomas and Councillor A Wilcox

[Mr GA Jones joined the meeting remotely prior to consideration of the Solicitor's report (minute 5 refers)]

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock and Virtually 10.00am – 11.25am;  
11.40am – 1.25pm; 2.00 – 2.55pm]

### 1. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Alderman and Mrs J James.

### 2. **Disclosures of interest**

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

<b>Application and Reference</b>	<b>Member(s)/Officer(s)</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
Minute 6 below – general declaration as an NRW Board Member and Plantlife Trustee	Dr RM Plummer	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting
Minute 6(a) below NP/21/0085/FUL - Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement.	Councillor V Thomas	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting



– Meadow House  
Holiday Park, Stepside

<i>Minute 6(b) below</i> NP/21/0593/FUL Demolition of existing building & construction of 34 residential units incorporating class A1/A2/A3 and D2 floorspace at ground level & all associated development - Former Royal Mail Delivery Office, Warren Street, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7JR	Councillor S Skyrme- Blackhall Councillor C Williams	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting
---	--	--

### 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 1 February 2023 and 13 February 2023 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on the 1 February 2023 and 13 February 2023 be confirmed and signed.

### NOTED.

### 4. 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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/21/0085/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement. – Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepside	Mr R Talboys – objector County Cllr Alec Cormack Geraint John – Agent



NP/21/0593/FUL <i>Minute 6(b)</i> <i>refers</i>	Demolition of existing building & construction of 34 residential units incorporating class A1/A2/A3 and D2 floorspace at ground level & all associated development - Former Royal Mail Delivery Office, Warren Street, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7JR	Mr Rob Mitchell – Agent
NP/21/0786/FUL - <i>Minute 6(d)</i> <i>refers</i>	Refurbishment of ground floor store/cafe. Two storey rear extension to replace existing single storey extension. Proposed two bedroom flat to first floor – Village Store, 9, Angle Village, Angle, Pembrokeshire, SA71 5AT	Jane Newgent – objector Cllr Shan Williams – Community Councillor

## 5. 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.

## NOTED

## 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/21/0085/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Huw Pendleton, Celtic Holiday Parks  
PROPOSAL: Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement.  
LOCATION: Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepside, Narberth, Pembrokeshire, SA67 8NS

It was reported that Meadow House was a large caravan park accommodating just under 200 static caravan pitches. Forty-seven of these were permitted under a change from 55 touring pitches at the northern end of the holiday park (reference: NP/10/0450). Only 37 of the pitches had been implemented, with the intention of improving the internal layout of the caravan park and allowing a greater degree of landscaping, and it was 9 of the remaining pitches which were now being proposed for relocation to an area of land where no permission to site caravans had previously been approved. The overall number of pitches within the site was not proposed to be increased.

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when it had been deferred to allow a Committee Site Inspection to take place (Minute 3 refers). Since that meeting, the officer advised that the description of the proposal had been changed slightly, in agreement with the applicant, to "Extension of formal caravan site boundaries to allow for the re-distribution of 9 static caravans previously allowed under NP/10/0450, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement", so that it more accurately described the application, however there were no changes to the plans. Two further plans had also been submitted by the agent, the first showing the distance between the caravans and the neighbouring properties on a block plan, and the other showing the proposed levels of the caravans relative to those properties. It was noted that should planning permission be granted, these plans would be referenced in condition 2.

The officer noted that correspondence received from objectors had requested that Members walk along the footpath to the south of Church View, however this had not been possible, so a short video was shown of the view. It had also been noted that the Caravan Park was visible from the coast path, and the officer hoped that the application of the landscaping condition to the whole site would provide additional screening of those caravans which were most visible from that aspect.



The first of three speakers was Mr R Talboys, who was objecting to the application. He stated that the area under discussion was refused permission by the Planning Inspectorate in 2012, and he considered that the grounds cited were still applicable. He also noted that application NP/10/450 reduced the number of caravans pitches from 55 to 47 statics – a reduction of 8 units, however the application before the Committee was for 9 units, which would take the number of caravans above that for which it was licensed. He also believed that under the code of practice for caravans sites, no caravan should be located within three metres of the boundary hedge, yet some of those proposed were less than a metre away. He noted that the hedge was extremely thin and provided no screening for the development and the clubhouse beyond, and no sectional drawing had been provided showing the elevations of the proposed caravan pitches, only photographs. Mr Talboys went on to reference policies 1, 14 and 32 of the Local Development Plan and did not believe that the application complied with these. He noted the removal of existing trees, shrubs and bushes which provided a feeding habitat for birds, small mammals and other wildlife, that run-off from the site into the highway, which was at a lower level, was not sustainable, and that the application caused an unacceptably adverse impact in respect of visual intrusion.

The second speaker was Councillor Alec Cormack, who, as he had addressed the previous meeting of the Committee, had three minutes in which to speak. He observed that Members had now had an opportunity to come to their own conclusions on whether the development harmed the amenity of residents, having heard from Mr Talboys, and Mr Evans at the previous meeting; and whether the visual impact was acceptable. He stated that in rejecting the 2012 appeal, the Planning Inspector had found that a similar proposal had had an unacceptable impact, however the officer's report had reached the opposite conclusion. He acknowledged that this was a finely balanced judgement and it was for Members to decide.

Councillor Cormack went on to refer to change of description and expressed concern that the extension of the formal caravan site boundary did not appear to be addressed in the officer's report. He also noted that there was little information on NP/10/450 and was unclear whether this permission had been implemented as the block plan A2, which showed the layout approved by it, bore little resemblance to the actual layout on the ground; he surmised that the applicant had put larger caravans with decking on site and was now physically unable to fit 47 pitches on the land in question. He questioned that if it had not been lawfully implemented, there was no basis for moving the 9 non-existing caravan pitches. Finally he stated that there was a risk that the references to the



misleading plan A2 in the officers report might confuse a member of the public as it talked about caravans being relocated as part of the proposal.

The final speaker was Geraint John, the Agent, who also had three minutes. He noted that the application had been presented to the February meeting of the Committee when it had been deferred for a site visit. He had previously focussed on the acceptability of the proposal in policy terms with no increase in unit numbers. He considered that the residual queries had been addressed at the site visit which looked at the former condition of the application site and the relationship between the levels of the site and neighbouring properties. He stated that the application site was by no means a greenfield site, but had always functioned as a 'backyard' storage facility, and he considered the proposals constituted an efficient use of a previously developed part of the wider site. In terms of the felling of trees, these were non-native *leylandii* conifer trees which made a very limited contribution to local biodiversity and they had been recommended for removal by an ecology report that had been commissioned. With regard to the proximity of the caravans to neighbouring properties, plans produced since the last meeting showed that they would be set below the level of existing hedgerow and a significant distance away from properties on the opposite side of the public highway, when compared to residential amenity standards, with the hedgerow being retained and enhanced through the addition of a substantial buffer. He noted that officers considered the development to be acceptable and believed that as a result of a number of meetings and site visits, Members understood what was being proposed and its relationship with the site to the north.

One Member asked about the biodiversity implications of removing 40m of hedgerow for visibility splays, however the agent reassured the Committee that part of this was currently a stone wall and that only a conifer tree would be removed. As there would be planting in the buffer zone along the boundary he believed there would be a net biodiversity gain, rather than a loss. Another Member asked where the storage area for the site would be located going forward and was advised that the current compound area by the entrance would be retained and fenced and would be used more efficiently.

Another Member asked about levels on site, noting that some of the ground was made up, and Mr John advised that a plan showing that the units would be below the level of the hedge line and that the ground would be returned to that lower level.

Members also sought clarification on the number of units on the site and were advised that 47 units had been approved on the north western portion of the site, of which 37 had been implemented. Therefore there



was no increase in units, with 9 being relocated and a legal agreement would prevent any further units being placed on the north western part. The officer also clarified that the application that had been refused on appeal in 2012 was a separate matter, and the introduction of Supplementary Planning Guidance and a replacement Local Development Plan superseded the Inspector's decision. They also sought reassurance regarding the changed description, and the officer confirmed that the change of use of the land had been implicit in the original description and as there had been no material change, such an amendment could be made without consultation.

One Member noted that the reason given for relocation of the 9 units was to give a lower density on the northern field, however he had been surprised at the size of some of the units located there. The officer explained that the 2010 permission did not restrict the size of the caravans as long as they complied with the definition of a caravan, which the agent had confirmed was the case. However on the application before the Committee the caravans would be restricted, though condition 4, to the size of the units shown on the plan which were single, rather than double units. It was also requested that condition 12 be amended to add a British Standard colour reference for Sierra Brown and to change the wording of part xii of condition 14 to ensure plants become established. On the basis of these amended conditions, together with the reference to the additional plans in condition 2, the officer's recommendation of delegated approval was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to an appropriate agreement made under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, compliance with definition of a single unit static caravan, holiday occupancy condition, removal of certain permitted development rights, lighting, Door Mouse Conservation plan, visibility splay, parking, British Standard colour for the wall cladding and decking, tree protection, Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, noise management scheme and ground levels. Where no agreement was completed within three months of the resolution of Committee the application be refused.**

[The meeting was adjourned between 11.25am and 11.40am]



- (b) REFERENCE: NP/21/0593/FUL  
APPLICANT: Trillium (RMF) Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing building & construction of 34 residential units incorporating class A1/A2/A3 and D2 floorspace at ground level & all associated development.  
LOCATION: Former Royal Mail Delivery Office, Warren Street, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7JR

It was reported that this application was classed as major development. The site was within the Centre Boundary, the Retail Centre and the Conservation area of Tenby as defined by Local Development Plan 2 and officers considered that redevelopment of the vacant employment site to mixed residential and commercial use was acceptable in principle.

Correspondence had been received raising concerns over the lack of affordable housing within the development. Policy 48 of the Local Development Plan required on-site provision of 50% of affordable housing on sites of 2 or more dwellings in Tenby, subject to viability. A detailed viability assessment in line with the Affordable Housing SPG had been submitted and independently assessed and verified. The conclusion of the assessment indicated that there was limited viability on this site and that five units would be the limit that could be provided without the development becoming unviable. This would be secured through a legal agreement, and in response to Members' concerns regarding the level of affordable housing provided, the officer added that a clause could be included to require the viability to be revisited within a 3 year period as market conditions could change.

Six letters of objection had been received and these were summarised and addressed in the officers' report. This concluded that following consideration of the policies contained within the statutory Development Plan and National Planning Policy and having regard to all material considerations it was considered that the development would be in accord with the Development Plan and the development was considered to provide a development which was acceptable in principle and could be supported by officers. The recommendation was one of delegated approval, subject to completion of a legal agreement within 3 months.

At the meeting the officer advised the Committee that he was proposing some minor wording changes to conditions 5, 6 and 11 and these were displayed for the Committee.

The Agent, Rob Mitchell, then addressed the Committee. He advised that he and his clients had been working closely with officers for months and he believed that the result was a high quality redevelopment scheme.





The site had previously been used as a Royal Mail Delivery Office but had been vacant for a number of years and marketed since 2019. He said that officers were supportive of demolition of the vacant building which did not make a positive contribution to the area, and that its redevelopment for a mixed residential and commercial use was advocated in policy terms; the commercial units would be suitable for a variety of occupiers. Mr Mitchell stated that the development would deliver a number of affordable units on site, but that such delivery was always subject to a viability assessment, and that this had been submitted and assessed by the Authority's Assessor. The affordable units would be secure by legal agreement.

The Agent went on to note that the site lay within the Conservation Area and was near to a number of very sensitive heritage assets. He and his client had worked closely with officers, and the proposed traditional design acknowledged and respected the setting of the listed chapels and particularly did not compete with them for height. Cadw had concluded that the development would also improve the setting of the town walls. He believed that the design captured the town's Victorian character and was in keeping with the area.

He noted that the location was highly accessible and parking was not required, however the development proposed 10 parking spaces, including electric vehicle charging. Trees would be protected and maintained and additional landscaping and planting was proposed, in addition to biodiversity enhancements.

In conclusion Mr Mitchell said that the development delivered on sustainable development, supported economic and planning objectives, delivered much needed affordable units on site, provided modern commercial space to boost the vitality of the area, enhanced the Conservation Area and safeguarded local heritage assets.

In response to a question from a Members, Mr Mitchell advised that the roof terrace could be accessible to a number of apartments, however it would be for the management company to decide which apartments, however it would be mindful of the potential for disturbance to adjacent apartments and other neighbours, and this would be an issue particularly if it was open to all 34 units. It would also be for them to manage security and in this respect, cameras were often installed in communal areas. He also noted that Environmental Health had its own regulations with regard to noise. Officers added that a condition would be included to require screening on the terrace to prevent overlooking of neighbouring properties and that building regulations would ensure such barriers maintained safety. Any noise issues would be dealt with by public protection should they arise in future.



Other questions related to the car parking spaces and the heights of the buildings, and Mr Mitchell replied that it was anticipated that the ground floor units would be allocated a parking space each, and he confirmed that the drawings provided were to scale. The officer confirmed that the buildings would be lower than both churches.

Members agreed that the design was an improvement on the existing buildings, but some expressed concerns regarding the lack of parking, the level of affordable housing proposed and the use of the roof terrace. They suggested that the affordable units could each be allocated a parking space and also that access to the roof terrace could be restricted to a single unit. However the officer recommendation of delegated approval, subject only to the amended conditions outlined, was moved and seconded.

Another Member asked whether the affordable housing would be for those persons with a local connection. The Director replied that the Authority didn't have a local connection policy, however it could be possible to restrict use of the building to Use Class C3 (primary residence) only and therefore remove permitted development rights to prevent Use Classes C5 and C6 (second home and holiday let), however if Members were minded to ask for such a condition, she would recommend that the application be deferred until the next meeting to allow for the implications of this to be included in the report. The opportunity could then be taken to have further discussions with the applicant/agent regarding the roof terrace. The officer also confirmed that issues of affordable housing had been subject to viability appraisal, although the Solicitor warned Members that although it was not possible to revisit affordable housing for the scheme as per the Officers recommendation, restrictions on use may impact on viability and that this could result in less affordable housing.

A motion to defer the application until the next meeting was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee.**

[Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall tendered her apologies and left the meeting at this juncture.]



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/21/0594/CAC  
APPLICANT: Trillium (RMF) Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing building in tandem proposed construction of 34 residential units incorporating class A1/A2/A3 and D2 floor space at ground level & all associated development.  
LOCATION: Former Royal Mail Delivery Office, Warren Street, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7JR

It was reported that this application could not be considered until a decision on NP/21/0593/FUL had been reached.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee**

[The Committee was adjourned between 1.25pm and 2.00pm]

[Councillor Mrs D Clements tendered her apologies and left the meeting before the vote was taken on the following application]

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/21/0786/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms L Middleton  
PROPOSAL: Refurbishment of ground floor store/cafe. Two storey rear extension to replace existing single storey extension. Proposed two bedroom flat to first floor.  
LOCATION: Village Store, 9, Angle Village, Angle, Pembrokeshire, SA71 5AT

This item was before the Committee as the recommendation of approval was contrary to a policy of the Local Development Plan 2. A number of objections had been received and these were summarised and addressed in the officer's report.

It was reported that the site was currently vacant, having previously been the village shop and post office at ground floor level for a number of years. There was a single room at first floor level, previously used as shop storage. Since its initial submission, the scheme had been revised to reduce the size of the first floor to reflect that of the current ground floor footprint, with the proposal now including a 2-bedroom flat at the first-floor level.

In terms of compliance with Policy, the refurbishment of the village store was considered to be acceptable and in accord with Local and National Development Plan policies. Were the shop currently in use, the use of the upstairs as a flat would not require planning permission, but the extension of the first floor would require full planning permission. The very strong



fall-back position of the use of the flat above the shop as a part of a mixed A1/C3 use was a significant material consideration when assessing this proposed development.

The site lay within a high risk C2 Flood Zone for both tidal and fluvial flood events - the culverted watercourse which ran below, and adjacent to, the property, created high surface water flood risk. The site also lay within the Coastal Change Management Area. The flood zone extended along the rear access to the property and the street frontage, which would have an impact on potential means of escape or access for emergency workers in the event of a flood. The ground floor proposal of a shop and café on a similar footprint to the existing building was a less vulnerable use and would comply with TAN 15 guidance and the Authority's LDP 2, however the first-floor element of the application proposed a highly vulnerable use (residential) within a C2 flood zone and within the Coastal Change Management Area. This element was contrary to the Local Development Plan 2 policy approach and contrary to TAN 15.

In this instance, there was also the fall back of a permitted mixed retail and residential use in terms of the permitted development rights for a flat above a shop as the retail use was not considered to have been lost from the site. In this instance, the recommendation was to suggest a condition requiring the applicant to formulate and submit a flood evacuation plan, (which should also be displayed prominently in the flat) and to design-in flood resistance and/or resilience measures to the property. Natural Resources Wales were happy with the proposal.

With regard to concerns about amenity and privacy, the development proposed a 2 storey rear perpendicular extension, which extended 10.2m from the rear elevation of the host property. To provide screening of the large, glazed opening proposed to be introduced to the western side elevation of the proposed extension, and of the rear seating area, a 2.4m high (rising to 3m) boundary wall was proposed to be introduced along the south-western edge of the culvert. Under building regulations, an external platform and stair was also required as means of escape for flats over retail premises.

At the meeting it was noted that the agent had agreed a last-minute revision to amend the flat roof to a grass/sedum roof as it was visible within the Conservation Area. Two additional conditions were also proposed – one seeking further details of the planting specification for the roof, and the wall proposed between the two dwellings to ensure it was sympathetic to the location, and the second to ensure that the rear flat roof could not be used as an external seating/amenity area.



The first of two speakers was Jane Newgent who was representing neighbours adjacent to the property. Her first point was that the proposal included two doors to the front elevation where there had previously been one, and that this changed the façade of the building; she noted that changes to the frontages of other buildings in the village had been rejected in the past. She also asked that there be a wall or fencing of significant height along the length of the boundary between numbers 9 and 10 in order to maintain privacy. Other areas of concern were regarding deliveries to, and parking outside of the shop as the road at this point was very narrow, and the storage of rubbish to the rear due to smell and rodents. Reassurances were also requested that the ground floor would not become a holiday let if the shop were to fail and that the drainage from the adjacent flat roof would continue to be managed.

Members asked Ms Newgent about her concerns regarding the viability of the shop, and she replied that despite many attempts, a shop had struggled in the past. Officers noted that they wished to encourage the shop as a community facility and understood that the applicant wished to make it appealing to both tourists and locals throughout the year. Also that a further application would be required should change of use of the ground floor to residential be sought.

The Second speaker was Shan Williams, speaking on behalf of the Community Council. She agreed that the additional door to the front of the property changed its look and asked why a secondary internal door could not be created. She also asked whether there could be a removal of permitted development rights to prevent use of the property as a second home or holiday let, as about a third of properties within the village were second homes and there were very few places for permanent rent. She also agreed that parking could be an issue, and that if a lorry was delivering, other traffic could not get through due to the narrowness of the road. She drew particular attention to the need for a disabled neighbour to park their car and noted that there was little off road parking in that part of the village. She was also concerned about safety as the Community Council was soon to take over the nearby play park. Nevertheless, the Community Council would like to see a shop return to the village alongside some accommodation for someone to live in.

The officer replied that she did not consider there would be any harm to the Conservation Area as a result of the two doors. She also noted that the application had initially been for a holiday let, however she had asked that this be changed to full residential as this allowed more flexibility going forward. Nevertheless, she understood that the intention was for the holiday use of the flat to subsidise the shop during its first few years.



Members were supportive of the application, and noted that many villages were in great need of a shop/post office. The recommendation of approval subject to conditions, including the two additional conditions suggested, was moved and seconded. Some Members remained concerned about traffic and asked whether a traffic management plan could be conditioned. Officers replied that they didn't think that would be reasonable, however a construction traffic management plan could be added; the proposer and seconder agreed to the inclusion of such a condition.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, surface water drainage, archaeological scheme of investigation, Construction Environmental Management Plan, retention of trees and hedges, scheme for privacy screening, flood evacuation, boundary treatments, opening hours of café and shop, no use of garden area for café customers, disposal and storage of waste, conservation rooflights, external surfaces to be permeable, lighting, biodiversity enhancement scheme, external finishes, construction traffic management plan, material details for the flat roof, handrail and screening wall and no use of the flat roof as an amenity space.**

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/22/0684/S73  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs K & S Weston  
PROPOSAL: Variation of condition No's 5 & 6 of NP/21/0431/FUL - Change to closing time & use of rear garden for external seating area.  
LOCATION: Ye Old World Cafe, Bosherton, Pembroke, Pembrokeshire, SA71 5DN

It was reported that this application would be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

**Noted.**

## **7. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 2 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.

Although not an appeal, the Director noted that a decision had been received in respect of the application by Blue Gem Wind Ltd under the Electricity Act 1989 for a floating offshore wind development in the Celtic Sea, southwest of the coast of Pembrokeshire. The Welsh Government



Minister's decision to approve the application subject to conditions would be circulated to Members after the meeting.

**Noted.**

**8. Tree Preservation Order TPO 148 – Land south of Habitabilities, Tenby**

It was reported that this TPO had been confirmed without objection.

**Noted.**

