

Development Management Committee

3 September 2025

Present

Councillor Dr SL Hancock (Chair)

Councillor S Alderman, Councillor M Bowen, Councillor D Clements, Councillor C George, Dr M Havard, Mr J Hogg (observer), Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall, Dr RM Plummer and Councillor V Thomas.

Councillor A Tinley joined the meeting during consideration of application NP/24/0521/FUL (Minute 2 refers).

Officers in attendance

Ms K Attrill, (Development Management Manager), Mr J Houser (Planning Officer), Mr M Kent (Monitoring Officer), Mrs S Morris (Director of Place and Engagement), Mr T Phillips (Solicitor), Mr A Richards (Principal Planning Officer), Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes)

[Virtual meeting 10.00am – 10.50am;
11.00am - 12.05pm]

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

The Chair noted that Mr J Hogg and Ms H Gwenllian had been appointed to the Authority by Welsh Government on 1st September. Mr Hogg was therefore observing as he had not yet undertaken the relevant training and Ms Gwenllian had sent her apologies.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor T Evans, Ms H Gwenllian, Mrs S Hoss, Councillor B Price and Councillor C Williams.

2. **Disclosures of interest**

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

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
Minute 6(b) below NP/24/0521/FUL - Erection of agricultural building for milking parlour	Councillor D Clements	Remained in the meeting and took full part in the debate and voting
& construction of collecting yard, feed pad, silage clamp, dirty water	Councillor S Alderman	Withdrew from the meeting while the



lagoon & associated works - Long House, Trefin

application was discussed

Minute 6(c) below
NP/25/0249/FUL -
Proposed Machinery
Workshop - Trewern
Farm,
Felindre Farchog,
Crymych,

Councillor S Alderman

Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 9 July 2025 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

On the proposal of Councillor Dr Hancock, seconded by Dr Havard, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 9 July 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.

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/24/0521/FUL Minute 6(b) refers	Erection of agricultural building for milking parlour & construction of collecting yard, feed pad, silage clamp, dirty water lagoon & associated works – Long House, Trefin	Paul Niedzwiedzki – Objector Christopher James – 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/23/0492/MOD
 Proposal: Request for a modification to a S.106 legal agreement in relation to schedule 2 (affordable housing) pertaining to Section 106 Agreement (NP/10/511) as varied by a S106 Deed agreed under NP/14/0280
 Location: Blockett Farm, Little Haven

It was reported that the application proposed the modification of a Section 106 legal agreement relating to a housing site at Blockett Lane, Little Haven for six dwellings (application reference NP/10/511). The existing legal agreement required the delivery of 50% affordable housing, equating to three affordable units to be transferred to a Registered Social Landlord (RSL).

The original application had been made in 2010 under the adopted Local Development Plan 1 which had a policy requirement for 50% affordable housing. Since this date, the Local Development Plan 2 had been prepared with updated viability evidence. The adopted LDP 2 (adopted September 2020) has a policy requirement for 20% of new dwellings to be made affordable in the St Brides Bay Housing Submarket Area (Policy 48 'Affordable Housing'). The original application had been varied by two subsequent Section 73 applications, varying matters of visibility splays and access and removing conditions relating to Sustainable Code for Homes which had subsequently been absorbed by Building Regulations.



A Financial Viability Assessment had been undertaken by the District Valuer on behalf of the applicant in October 2019 which concluded no affordable housing could be supported by the development, however no formal application had been made to the Authority and due to staffing issues and Covid, progress with considering the request for a modification had been delayed. Following discussions with the applicant in 2023 the Authority had commissioned Nigel Sinnott Consulting Ltd (NSCL) to consider matters further. The assessment by NSCL had concluded that the provision of one affordable rented unit (88m² GIA end terrace) was viable and could be supported by the scheme.

The report therefore proposed a modification to the S.106 agreement to reduce the affordable housing contribution from three dwellings to one. The recommendation was one of delegation to issue a modified S106 agreement within 3 months of the date of the meeting and if evidence was provided to demonstrate that there was a lack of demand for on-site provision of affordable housing, a financial sum would be required instead.

At the meeting, the Development Management Manager apologised that the plan attached to the report showing the 'red line' denoting the site of the application was incorrect and the correct one was displayed. It was also suggested by Officers, that the description of the application be changed to that provided above, to reference two relevant S106 agreements as there were 2 potential schemes which could be implemented due to a later S106 agreement.

In response to Members' questions, it was clarified that the site also had a separate S106 agreement relating to matters other than affordable housing, and that was unchanged by the current application. With regard to the provision of affordable housing on-site, or through a commuted sum, officers clarified that it would be for the developer to demonstrate that there was no demand from affordable housing providers for the on-site unit. However, meetings were held regularly with the providers to plan for affordable housing across the Park and the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance prioritised the spend of commuted sums in the same community for a period of three years before spend on sites outside was considered.

Members were disappointed at the loss of affordable housing but agreed that the recommendation provided a sensible way forward. Delegation of the application to officers, subject to the corrections noted by the officer, was proposed by Dr Havard, seconded by Councillor Clements, and this was carried.



Decision: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive, the Director of Place and Engagement or the Development Management Manager to issue a modified Section 106 Legal Agreement in relation to schedule 2 (affordable housing) pertaining to Section 106 Agreement (NP/10/511) as varied by a S106 Deed agreed under NP/14/0280 to require the provision of one affordable unit on site, or equivalent off-site provision should evidence be provided of a lack of demand for provision on site. The modified S106 agreement shall be issued within three months from the date of this meeting.

[Having disclosed a prejudicial interest, Councillor Alderman left the meeting; Councillor Clements reiterated her personal declaration. Councillor Tinley joined the meeting during the presentations and abstained from voting.]

- (b) Reference: NP/24/0521/FUL
Proposal: Erection of agricultural building for milking parlour & construction of collecting yard, feed pad, silage clamp, dirty water lagoon & associated works
Location: Long House, Trefin,

It was reported that the application sought full planning permission for the development of new agricultural infrastructure at Long House farm, to support the expansion and modernisation of existing dairy operations. The proposed works included the erection of a purpose-built milking parlour building, a concrete collecting yard, a feed pad, silage clamp, and a dirty water lagoon, all designed to improve animal welfare, operational efficiency, and environmental management on the site.

The development was considered essential for the functioning of the farm enterprise and had been designed to minimise landscape impact through careful siting adjacent to existing farm buildings and the use of traditional agricultural materials. Consultation responses from statutory consultees raised no objection subject to conditions relating to drainage, landscaping, and ecological protection measures. The scale and nature of the proposal were deemed appropriate for its location and were considered to support the continued viability of a traditional agricultural holding.

The proposal was therefore considered to accord with the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan, including those relating to sustainable rural enterprise, landscape protection, and the conservation of the National Park, and the recommendation was one of approval, subject to conditions.



At the meeting, the officer highlighted that concerns had been expressed by the public regarding intensification of agricultural use of the land but explained that planning permission was not required for such a change. He also noted that the operation was low intensity, with the cattle grazed outdoors, and that Natural Resources Wales (NRW) were satisfied with the information provided with the application. In response to a comment, officers agreed to amend the wording of condition 3, regarding control of lighting, to add the words “additional lighting thereafter” and to add an informative to reference the Authority’s Dark Skies Supplementary Planning Guidance.

[Due to the first speaker having connection problems, the meeting was adjourned between 10.50am and 11.00am]

The first of two speakers was Paul Niedzwiedz. Before he began he asked who had authorised the building as the application was partly retrospective. Officers advised that unless it was a listed building, it was not an offence to undertake development without planning permission, and therefore applications were treated in the same way, irrespective of whether or not they were retrospective.

Mr Neidwidski stated that this was a significant application, constituting a major change of use from arable and sheep farming to intensive dairy farming, creating what was probably the largest dairy farm on coastal land in the north of the county. He therefore considered that it would have a very significant visual impact on the landscape and also an ecological impact due to increased levels of nitrates and ammonia. His concerns were threefold: firstly, due to the size of the herd, a SCAIL (Simple Calculation of Atmospheric Impact Limits) ammonia assessment had been conducted which highlighted the impact on the West Wales Marine Special Area of Conservation, but this hadn’t taken account of the prevailing winds which he said would blow significant amounts of ammonia straight into the nearby Abercastle Bay. He noted that in similar ammonia sensitive sites, a limit had been placed on the size of the herd, and he asked that this be done in this case. Such a limit would also improve the visual impact and the impact on walkers using the paths which crossed the farm, many of whom had been dissuaded from crossing the fields because they contained hundreds of cows and were surrounded by an electric fence.

His second point related to management of the slurry lagoon which he considered to be very large – three times the size of an Olympic swimming pool – and not covered, in accordance with UK Government advice, to limit emissions. Mr Neidwidski’s third concern related to the visual impact of the proposed milking parlour from the south and east, especially the eastern side of Abercastle Valley from which it would not be



viewed within the existing footprint of the farm complex. He did not believe that the new hedge and embankment would mitigate its visibility from this aspect, particularly due to its height, and questioned whether it needed to be so high, or whether it could not have been located in one of the existing redundant buildings. He also believed that the 18 translucent roof panels would be very visible when the lights were on, particularly from the nearby Garn Fawr dark sky discovery site. He therefore requested that there be a limit on the size of the herd, that the slurry lagoon be covered, that the Committee visit the site to assess the visual impact and that if permitted, the building should not be constructed with translucent roof panels.

In response to the speaker, the Solicitor noted that under section 55(2)(e) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 agricultural use of land was not treated as development, and therefore moving from one type of agriculture to another didn't constitute a material change of use. Officers also drew attention to the responses from NRW and the Authority's Ecologist, neither of whom had objected to the proposed development. It was noted that the Ecologist had undertaken the first stage of a Habitat Regulation Assessment and concluded that there was no likely significant effect on the basis of the information provided. A limit of herd numbers had previously only been conditioned where the test of likely significant effect had identified that there was a potential impact.

A Member also noted that Welsh Government did not currently require slurry pits to be covered and considered that more intensive farming led to higher ammonia levels.

The second speaker was Christopher James, the applicant. He welcomed the report to the Committee and noted that the SCAIL assessment had been approved by NRW. He advised that although they hadn't farmed at Long House for very long, he had farmed within the National Park at Stackpole for many years, where he had used the same system. Land had been rented there from the National Trust and had created a more biodiverse environment, and he was working with the National Trust once again to increase biodiversity at the current location, planting many trees and strengthening hedgerows. The system would also increase carbon sequestration in the soil. As the land was in one block, there would be no impact on traffic as the cows would walk across the fields and there would be no need for slurry tankers. Turning to the height of the building, Mr James noted that this was lower than the buildings it was to be built against and that a tall grain store had been removed. Sheds had also been repaired using Yorkshire Boarding. Finally considering the size of the herd, this had been designed to fall within the Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ) regulations within Wales and was dictated by the amount of land and human resources available.



One Member asked how often the building would be lit, given that the animals would spend most of their time outside. As the applicant had a problem with connection, the officer replied that there were no sheds proposed for animal housing as this was not an intensive indoor herd. Another Member questioned whether the translucent panels could be removed and the Development Management Manager advised that natural light was desirable from both a sustainability and an animal welfare point of view, however an additional internal lighting condition could be added, in addition to the informative relating to the Authority's Dark Skies Supplementary Planning Guidance referred to above; Members agreed this would be helpful and were happy to delegate the wording of such a condition to officers.

The applicant returned to the meeting and advised that he was happy to work with officers to minimise light emissions. In response to another question, he advised that soil samples had been taken from the farm to determine the level of carbon, and this would be repeated annually. The system of mixed species and long grazing rotations tended to capture more carbon than traditional cutting or arable farming.

Members welcomed the expected improvement in biodiversity and the environment, and that subject to conditions, including the revised and additional conditions in respect of lighting, the recommendation of approval was proposed by Dr Plummer, seconded by Councillor James and carried.

Decision: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of development, accordance with approved plans and documents, external and internal lighting, landscaping, use of native species, and scheme for disposal of surface water.

- (c) Reference: NP/25/0249/FUL
Proposal: Proposed Machinery Workshop
Location: Trewern Farm, Felindre Farchog, Crymych

This full planning application sought permission for the erection of a new agricultural building at Trewern Farm, Felindre Farchog. The proposed building would be used as a machinery workshop associated with the ongoing agricultural use of the holding.

It was reported that officers had met on site with the applicant and their agents to discuss potential concerns regarding the scale and siting of the proposed development, and to ascertain that the building was reasonably necessary for agricultural purposes. During the initial assessment, officers had expressed concerns that the siting and design would have a negative



impact on the surrounding area. Following these discussions, the applicant amended the proposal. The building had been repositioned so that it would sit lower in the landscape, positioned below the height of existing farm buildings and also lower than the farmhouse.

The design and siting of the building was considered acceptable within the wider complex of buildings. The proposed building under the current application would be sited within the developed envelope of the farmstead, and was considered acceptable as it did not extend the built footprint into open countryside and was in keeping with the operational character and lawful use of the site. It was also noted that the nature and intended use of the building as a machinery workshop was consistent with the current use of the area and the operational needs of the farm. It was not considered appropriate or necessary for livestock accommodation to be sited in this location, given its established function as a machinery storage yard.

It was noted that the site lay near to an area of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland and also close to the designated boundary of the North Pembrokeshire Woodlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Although the proposed building was located outside the designated SAC boundary, its proximity necessitated consideration under the Habitats Regulations (HRA). Any potential impacts, particularly from lighting, noise, dust or surface water runoff had to be avoided or appropriately mitigated to ensure that no adverse effect on site integrity occurred. A preliminary screening of Test of Likely Significant Effects would be expected to conclude that the development, due to its scale, location within the developed farmyard, and the absence of direct hydrological connectivity, would not adversely affect the qualifying features of the SAC. Nonetheless, a condition would be imposed to strictly control any future lighting and to encourage on-site biodiversity enhancements. The recommendation was one of approval, subject to conditions.

Given the planning history of the site, Members were concerned about further buildings on the site and the use to which these may be put. They were reassured by officers that the previously approved workshop/storage building had a condition preventing its use for animals however it was not considered to be large enough for the proposed use and did not provide secure storage. Officers were thanked for addressing visibility concerns and including conditions in respect of use and lighting, however it was requested that condition 4 be amended to add the words “additional lighting thereafter” and to add an informative to reference the Dark Skies Supplementary Planning Guidance. The recommendation of approval, subject to inclusion of the amended condition, was moved by Dr Plummer, seconded by Councillor James, who noted the importance for farmers to



be able to securely store their equipment due to problems of theft in rural areas. This was carried.

Decision: That the application be approved, subject to conditions in respect of the timing of development, accordance with approved plans and documents, use of the building, lighting, landscaping and surface water drainage

[Councillor Alderman returned to the meeting]

7. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 7 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.

Decisions in respect of 4 Pisgah Cottages, Cresselly and Plasdwbl, Mynachlogddu were appended to the report, both appeals having been dismissed.

Noted.

