

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

6 June 2018

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

Councillor P Baker, Mrs D Clements, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor P Harries, Mrs G Hayward, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor PJ Morgan, Dr RM Plummer, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland

*[Councillor M Evans arrived during consideration of item 4, the Solicitors report concerning Members' duties in determining applications]*

[Tý'r Pererin, St Davids 10.00am – 12.15pm]

## 1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Mr A Archer and Dr R Heath-Davies.

## 2. Disclosures of interest

The following Member disclosed an interest in the application referred to below:

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minutes 6(f) below</i> NP/18/0166/FUL - Regularising of the existing touring caravan site with the removal of one of the two entrance points, relocation of one unit pitch and landscaping works, Windy Hill Holiday Park, Stepside, Narberth	Councillor P Baker	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussions and voting thereon

## 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 25 April 2018 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 25 April 2018 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, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak (*the interested parties are listed below against their respective application(s), and in the order in which they addressed the Committee*):

<b>Reference number</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
NP/18/0051/OUT <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	38 Affordable residential dwellings, Hotel, 32 shared ownership & open market dwellings & associated car parking, access, landscaping, drainage & engineering works – Land at Glasfryn Lane, St Davids	Helen Silverstone – supporter Graham Perkins – objector Cllr David Lloyd – Pembrokeshire County Council Cllr Michael Chant – St Davids City Council Geraint John – Agent
NP/18/0131/FUL <i>Minute 6(d) refers</i>	Erection of detached garage – Atlantic View, Settlands Hill, Broad Haven	Mr Dilwyn Williams - Applicant

#### 5. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report was presented. It was mentioned that the report had been updated and now summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, outlining the purpose of the planning system and relevant considerations in decision making, the Authority's duty to carry out sustainable development, 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/18/0051/OUT  
APPLICANT: Pembs Housing Association, Mill Bay Homes Ltd & Swangate Dev Ltd & Premier Inn Hotels  
PROPOSAL: 38 Affordable residential dwellings, Hotel, 32 shared ownership & open market dwellings & associated car parking, access, landscaping, drainage & engineering works  
LOCATION: Land at Glasfryn Lane, St Davids

This application was reported to the Committee as it was classed as a major development and in view of the public interest in the application. The site had been the subject of a Members' site inspection on 26 March 2018. The application had been advertised as 'out of accord' with the Local Development Plan (LDP) as the whole site was allocated in it for housing and the application also included a Hotel.

The application comprised three elements – affordable housing, market dwellings and a 63 bed hotel. The dwellings would be a mixture of sizes of both one and two storeys in height. The hotel was 2.5 storey and 'L shaped' in form, with the roof of each wing broken up into three components. It also proposed a restaurant at ground floor which would accommodate 43 covers. Landscaping, footpaths and car parking were also proposed alongside each element of the development.

There would be three access points serving the different elements of the site.

281 letters of objection had been received, and 78 letters of support and these were summarised in the report. It was reported at the meeting that additional letters of both support and objection had been received since the report had been written which reiterated the comments already made and considered during the preparation of the report.

The report considered in detail all aspects of the development. It noted that the proposed development site accommodated the majority of housing allocation HA737 of the LDP, which allocated the land for a total of 90 units. The policy requirement for affordable housing on this allocation was 25% which would amount to 22 of the 90 units being affordable. The application proposed to provide a total of 70 residential units, 38 of these would be affordable housing provided by a registered social landlord. This was a 72% increase in the amount of affordable housing expected from the site. While the hotel element was not in accordance with the allocation in the LDP, it did not impinge on the



housing strategy of the Plan as the proposed provision of affordable housing was already greater than what would be required under the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance. Market housing was not needed in the National Park, and therefore the loss of market housing land to a hotel was not considered to be harmful to the National Park or the housing needs of the community.

With regard to ecology, the site was located approximately 120m from the boundary a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which had public access. Further information had been received in respect of surface water drainage for the whole site which could affect the SAC and this was being consulted on. This information was required in order to carry out an appropriate assessment of the development under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 which had to be found acceptable prior to determination. Although it was also considered likely that the development would increase pressure on the SAC from dog walkers, this could be offset by the provision of interpretation boards at the entrance to the SAC and the provision of dog waste receptors. This could be secured via a legal agreement.

Dŵr Cymru /Welsh Water had advised that the proposal would overload the existing Waste Water Treatment Works, and reinforcement would be required to provide capacity for the development. The applicant had indicated that they would provide the financial contribution and legal agreement to enable this to take place, however since the report had been written, Dŵr Cymru /Welsh Water had further advised that they would like this to be covered by means of a planning condition.

It was also noted that a consultation response had been received from Cadw which had no adverse comments on the application.

The report concluded that following consideration of the policies contained within the LDP and National Planning Policy and having regard to all material considerations that the proposal would be in keeping with the aims of the LDP in that the development would provide new residential properties and a hotel, whilst sustaining the character of the National Park and not impacting on privacy or amenity of neighbours.

As such, and subject to planning obligations being provided ("S106 Agreements") and a schedule of suitable conditions, including further conditions to agree levels on the site and the upgrading of the Waste Water Treatment Works, the development was considered to be acceptable and the recommendation was one of delegation to officers to grant planning permission subject to an acceptable appropriate assessment, conditions as outlined above and in the report and completion of S106 Agreements in respect of the heads of terms set out.



The first of five speakers was Helen Silverstone who supported the application. She noted that those she was speaking on behalf of people who had generally been born, brought up and still lived in the City, they had no vested interest and wanted a vibrant, forward looking community, not a 1950's Disney-like theme park. To achieve this, housing that was accessible to young people was needed, together with year round jobs. Currently housing was very expensive and out of reach of young people, so they lived elsewhere. The application would also therefore have benefits for schools on the peninsula, several of which were on the point of closure, as the current population was ageing and many properties had been turned into summer lets. More viable schools meant a secure educational future for children. Families also needed jobs and the Premier Inn would create an extended season, with facilities that could be used out of season, which would benefit leisure facilities in the City as well as shops and other food outlets. There was likely to be a higher footfall at the Cathedral. Importantly it would also show that St Davids was open for business. Allowing young people to stay in the City would also increase the use of the Welsh language, which had declined in recent years. Ms Silverstone believed that the proposals would uphold all of the wellbeing statements in the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act and should be supported by the Authority as part of its statutory duty to support the economic and cultural wellbeing of communities. She urged Members to approve the application.

Mr Graham Perkins next addressed the Committee. He explained that at a public meeting in June 2017 a fair and balanced presentation on the application had been made and more than 300 people had voted against with less than 20 in favour of the application. 70% of the letters received by the Authority had been against the development. While he agreed that St Davids needed housing, it did not need a hotel. He noted that the land had been allocated for housing, and the objectors were not against that element of the development; he also understood that the housing would proceed with or without the hotel. The No to Premier Inn (NoPi) group had provided an independent economic assessment of the proposed hotel and this stated that the Economic Impact Assessment provided by the applicant was unreliable. Mr Perkins also stated that the LDP had come to the same conclusion, referring to paragraphs 4.152 and 4.153. He stated that the hotel was unnecessary and unwelcome, being three times the size of any existing hotel with as many beds as all the current accommodation put together. The planning statement submitted with the application estimated that more than 44,000 guests would stay at the hotel through the year, however there was no evidence to substantiate this claim that the brand would attract and deliver such numbers. With regard to the claim that 22 full time jobs would be created, he noted that currently there were many vacancies unfilled in the hospitality sector.



Centralised procurement would mean that there would be little benefit to local businesses and the business' profits would not remain in the locality. There would be thousands of additional cars and lorries, and Mr Perkins doubted whether St Davids would cope with them. The group supported the housing element of the development only and had provided evidence that a hotel was not needed; the developer had failed to demonstrate that it was. He concluded by saying that the development would be the first multinational to build on a greenfield site in a National Park and while the developer had promised to change the community forever, he questioned whether that was what City wanted.

Councillor David Lloyd then addressed the Committee in his capacity as County Councillor for St Davids and as an ex-Director of the Community Land Trust (CLT). He explained that the application had originally been submitted jointly Mill Bay Homes and the CLT, with the affordable homes to be developed by the latter and any profits used to provide match funding for a replacement swimming pool for the City. The controversy surrounding the inclusion of the Premier Inn within the partnership meant that the CLT had had to withdraw, however affordable housing remained part of the application and he felt it was imperative that this was built. Out of a total of 2675 dwellings, there were 447 second homes on the peninsula and 295 properties paying business rates as holiday lets. This meant that 37% of houses were not occupied by people who lived locally. This loss of housing had consequences for the economic viability of the community. The school roll had dropped from 500 to 390 in 2016 and the school had only survived with the loss of its sixth form; the rugby club did not have enough players for a second team and the football team no longer existed. For these reasons he supported the application. He also believed that St Davids was under-provided for as regards accommodation, a view shared by Keith Griffiths who owned the 5\* Twr y Felin Hotel, and that the Premier Inn would replace the hotel spaces lost in recent years. Councillor Lloyd referred to the experience in Tenby where the arrival of the Premier Inn had brought a major boost to trade and he was confident that the same would apply to St Davids. He also talked about a new initiative 'Discovering Lost Connections' which told of the inspirational story of St David and St Aidan; this joint bid with County Wexford was in its final assessment stage and would hopefully be successful and thereby develop trade out of season and encourage overseas visitors. Returning to the joint nature of the planning application, while Councillor Lloyd acknowledged it was not accurate to say that the hotel would enable the project, however by sharing the costs of submitting the application and the necessary survey work, it had made possible the unique proportion of affordable housing on the site. He believed that the development was an opportunity for the peninsula that should be grasped and asked the Committee to support the application.



Councillor Michael Chant from St Davids City Council was the next speaker. He explained that the Council had resolved to support all three elements of the application, with the hotel element being supported 6 votes to 2 on the basis of the employment that would be created. However this support was conditional on improvement of the Porthclais Sewerage Treatment Works (STW). He referred to a Welsh Water study which showed that the existing Works was biologically overloaded and could therefore not accommodate the development. The study also identified that the sludge storage did not meet the current required specification. The City Council were very concerned at this situation and supported the application on the condition that the STW issues were resolved. The Development Management Team Leader confirmed that this was what Welsh Water had requested.

The final speaker was Mr Geraint John, the Agent. He stated that the site was allocated in the LDP and that the proposal for a residential led mixed use development was acceptable. The scheme included 55% provision of affordable housing which was greater than required by the LDP and would therefore make a direct and significant contribution to affordable housing in St Davids. He added that the market housing element of the scheme might also be initially offered on the basis of local need as Mill Bay homes was a subsidiary of ateb, the Housing Association. This also meant the profit from the market housing would be covenanted and would go to the housing association for use in furtherance of its housing objects. There was also an element of shared equity housing which was in addition to the affordable housing. He believed that the hotel would provide considerable economic benefit through provision of a new product in the market, an elongated tourism season, additional spending and jobs both in the longer term and construction phase. This was an aside from its role in facilitating delivery of affordable housing by advancing the costs of the application. He added that discussions were ongoing with a local contractor to build out the scheme. Turning to the design, this had taken account of the site with assistance from the Design Commission for Wales and officers of the Authority, and would incorporate significant landscaping. The form and scale were considered to be acceptable and there would be no adverse impact on the special qualities of the National Park. The site was highly accessible, as confirmed by the recommendation of conditional consent by the Highway Authority. In fact he noted that the scheme had been assessed in detail and found to be acceptable by all statutory consultees, subject to conditions. Mr John considered the application to be appropriate and acceptable, in keeping with the aims of the LDP and the National Park, and he urged Members to approve it.

Members asked some questions of Mr John, regarding the advice of the Design Commission for Wales regarding the corner aspect of the hotel which they felt still looked blank, and also the materials to be used. Mr



John replied that following discussions with officers, glazing had been added at ground floor and additional fenestration at the upper floors. Selection of most materials had now been finalised and it was intended that a common palette of materials would tie the hotel into the rest of the development. Finally, one Member asked about the mix of affordable housing to be provided, being surprised that there were no 4 bed dwellings; the Agent confirmed that the types of dwelling had been agreed in conjunction with the Housing Authority based on demand in the area. Clarity was also sought on whether the affordable and shared equity dwellings would be subject to a local lettings policy, and officers confirmed that they understood the company operated a cascade policy, however the market housing, including that which may be offered with shared equity, was not conditioned for occupancy.

Members agreed that there was a need for affordable housing however there were some concerns regarding the hotel element of the scheme, with some reservations over its design and the potential for loss of remoteness and tranquillity being expressed. While acknowledging the real concerns of those who were opposed to the application, Members also considered the views that the hotel would operate year round and in a different part of the market, with those staying bringing an economic benefit to the community. The recommendation of approval was proposed and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to grant planning permission subject to an acceptable appropriate assessment; conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, lighting scheme, Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, highway requirements, construction management plan, parking and turning, landscaping scheme, details of hotel plant, samples of materials, drainage scheme, boundary treatment, site levels and sewerage treatment requirements; and planning obligations in the form of S106 legal agreements for provision of affordable housing, highway contribution, planning obligations and provision of waste receptors and information boards. Failure to complete the legal agreements within six months of the date of the meeting would allow officers to use their discretion to refuse the application.**

*[The meeting adjourned for 10 minutes]*





- (b) REFERENCE: NP/17/0283/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr S Stalbow, Pembrokeshire Housing Association  
PROPOSAL: Proposed erection of 23 affordable homes with associated access, parking, landscaping & engineering works  
LOCATION: Land at Station Road, Manorbier

The Director of Park Direction and Planning reminded Members that at the previous meeting of the Committee, they had been minded to refuse the application against officer recommendation and as she had been of the view that such a decision would be contrary to adopted planning policy, the Authority's 'cooling off' procedure had been invoked and it was before the Committee again this time for re-consideration.

The report before the Committee did not reproduce the officer reports to the Development Management Committees on 14 March and 25 April 2018, but focussed on the key material planning considerations, namely that the planning system was a plan-led system, with applications to be determined in accordance with the Local Development Plan (LDP) unless material considerations indicated otherwise. This gave applicants a degree of confidence in the outcome to balance against the cost of submitting an application. It also noted that prior to adoption, the LDP had been scrutinised at an Examination by an independent Inspector who had concluded that the site's inclusion in the LDP was sound. The report also detailed the amenities and facilities at Manorbier Station, as one of the reasons given for refusal at the previous meeting had been the belief that the site was not related to a settlement.

The officer acknowledged that this was not an easy decision for Members, however she believed that on balance the recommendation to delegate approval to officers subject to conditions and S106 legal agreement(s) was appropriate as there were more benefits than disbenefits for granting planning permission for this site to come forward for housing.

Several Members explained that their views had not changed since the previous meeting, with some considering that the site was not related to anywhere - being 1.7 miles to the nearest shop, had too high a density and of inappropriate design. It was also stated that there was likely to be a legal dispute regarding access to the drain that ran through the site. Others reiterated their support for the application which accorded with LDP policy and would help to sustain the community, particularly the school. While they acknowledged concerns regarding congestion at school times and the use of the road by large vehicles, it was not considered that this development would make the situation worse and the conditional support of the Highway Authority was noted. The



recommendation to delegate the grant of planning permission subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement was move and seconded.

The Solicitor reminded the Committee that the planning system was planned, with applications to be determined in accordance with the LDP unless material considerations indicated otherwise. If Members were to reject the officer recommendation, they had to give planning reasons which were sustained by evidence. He believed from the discussions to date that there was a lack of evidence to refuse the application and displace the allocation made in the LDP which had been endorsed as sound by an independent Inspector. He pointed out that a refusal would probably be subject to an appeal and in his opinion the Authority would be likely to lose and be at risk of an award of costs against it because the site was allocated.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer reminded the Committee that officers would not be able to defend any such appeal and it would therefore be up to Members to do so.

Summing up, one of the Members who was against the application noted that children living in the proposed development wouldn't necessarily attend the school and that the view of the community, that this was not a suitable location for a development, should be listened to.

As the application had been subject to the Authority's 'Cooling Off' Procedure, a recorded vote had to be taken. The result of the vote on the motion to delegate the application to officers to approve the application subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement as set out in the report was:

**For:** Councillor D Clements, Councillor M Evans, Councillor P Harries, Mrs G Hayward, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Dr R Plummer, Mr AE Sangster and Councillor M Williams; (9)

**Against:** Councillor P Baker, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor P Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor S Yelland (7)

**DECISION:** That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive / Director of Park Direction and Planning / Team Leader Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the interested person(s) entering into a satisfactory Section 106 Legal Agreement to procure no less than 50% of the dwellings on site to be built and retained as affordable housing. If the S106 legal agreement was not completed within 3 months, delegated power was given to officers to exercise discretion to refuse the application. And subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, Construction



**Method Statement, drainage scheme, construction phase traffic management plan, parking and turning, landscaping, lighting, removal of certain permitted development rights and undergrounding of cables.**

*[Councillor ML Evans tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture]*

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/17/0691/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr D Brown  
PROPOSAL: 16 Residential units, replace 85 tents and tourer pitches with 85 static caravans, sewerage pumping station & associated landscaping  
LOCATION: Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn.

Members requested that they be advised prior to the meeting of applications which had been withdrawn in future.

**NOTED.**

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/18/0131/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr D Williams  
PROPOSAL: Erection of detached garage  
LOCATION: Atlantic View, Settlands Hill, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest

It was reported that this application was before the Committee as the officer's recommendation was contrary to that of the Community Council.

Planning permission was sought for a detached single garage which would provide storage for equipment used in association with the upkeep of the grounds of the property and caravan site at this location and would be associated with the owners private accommodation. The site was a long standing business and officers considered that some storage was reasonably required. The structure would be subservient to existing structures and within the recognised curtilage and was therefore acceptable in principle.

Concern had been raised by the Havens Community Council that the development would amount to overdevelopment of the site and that it was not in keeping with the policy of the National Park. However, officers considered the proposed building to be visually in-keeping with the main building, situated within the less prominent part of the site and would be read as a small addition within the overall context of the site. The



proposal was not considered to result in a development which was of a scale incompatible with its surroundings or visually intrusive to the detriment of the amenity of properties within near proximity. It was therefore recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

Mr Dilwyn Williams, the applicant then addressed the Committee. He explained that the application had been the subject of scrutiny by officers and a positive recommendation had been reached. While he was aware of the concern expressed by the Community Council he contended that the garage, at 33m<sup>2</sup> represented a 1.4% increase in the developed area of the site which totalled 2550m<sup>2</sup>. Noting that the application accorded with the LDP, he endorsed the report to the Committee and asked Members to approve the application subject to conditions.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans and finishes to match existing.**

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/18/0155/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms B Devonald  
PROPOSAL: Repair of redundant cottages to form new dwelling & new garage/workshop  
LOCATION: "Waun-Y-Beddau", Nr Berea, St Davids

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn.

**NOTED.**

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/18/0166/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr L Forse, Boyer  
PROPOSAL: Regularising of the existing touring caravan site with the removal of one of the two entrance points, relocation of one unit pitch and landscaping works  
LOCATION: Windy Hill Holiday Park, Stepside, Narberth

It was reported that the application was before the Committee as it was classed as major development.

The officer explained that the site was a touring caravan site which had recently been granted a certificate of lawfulness for an existing use. It comprised a mix of seasonal tourer pitches with winter storage and bookable touring pitches to give a total of 71 pitches.

The existing site was well screened and not visible from public vantage points, and the minor changes proposed were not considered to have any significant impact on the wider landscape. Therefore the proposal was



considered to preserve the special qualities of this area of the National Park.

Following consideration of the policies contained within the Local Development Plan and National Planning Policy and having regard to all material considerations, officers considered that the development would retain a development while sustaining the local character and not impacting on privacy or amenity of neighbours. As such, and subject to suitable conditions, the development was considered to be acceptable and the recommendation was one of approval.

Councillor P Baker had declared a personal, but not prejudicial, interest in this application as he was a member of Saundersfoot Community Council, which had visited the site. He noted that it was well run and well screened and although it had been in operation for a number of years many of the Community Council members were unaware of its existence.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing, accordance with plans, seasonal holiday use only, holiday occupancy and surface water drainage.**

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/18/0198/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms Owen, Owen & Owen  
PROPOSAL: Erection of a new bungalow  
LOCATION: Land at Mead Lane, Manorbier

It was reported that the application was reported to the Committee as the officer recommendation was contrary to that of the Community Council.

The site lay within the Rural Centre boundary of Manorbier and was currently used as a modest allotment garden. Under the Local Development Plan, proposals for a single residential dwelling required payment of a commuted sum to help with the delivery of affordable housing, and the applicant had indicated that they agreed to the provision of such a sum.

Officers considered that the proposed dwelling would be an acceptable form of development at this location as it was shown that the size, design and external materials to be used for the proposed dwelling would be in keeping with historic setting and the existing development pattern of properties in the street scene. As such the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan and the recommendation was of delegation to officers to grant planning permission subject to a satisfactory unilateral undertaking to pay an affordable housing contribution and to conditions as set out in the report.



Manorbier Community Council had objected on the grounds of scale, materials, unsympathetic design and highway concerns. A letter of objection had also been received from a neighbouring property and details of these were set out in the report. It was reported at the meeting that further objections had since been received from five individuals, which referred to the impact on the historic character of Manorbier Conservation Area, obliteration of historic features, concern regarding the rear boundary wall, parking difficulties and overlooking.

The Chair of the Authority noted that she had also received an email from an objector who stated that she had received no notification, despite the site being visible from her property. She was also concerned that the walls surrounding the site were ancient and of historical significance in relation to the castle. The officer responded that site notices had been erected and neighbours with a shared boundary had been notified by letter. With regard to the walls, she noted that the Building Conservation Officer had recommended conditional consent noting that the dwelling was set back in the site, to retain the openness of the area to the front, however it was still set back from the wall.

Given that the Community Council had grave concerns regarding the size of the proposed dwelling and the access, and that there had been five additional letters of objection, one Member proposed a site visit. Being concerned about the design of the proposed dwelling, it was also requested that the Building Conservation Officer attend.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow the Committee to undertake a site inspection.**

## **7. Appeals**

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 4 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.

**NOTED.**

## **8. Thanks**

The Chair concluded by thanking officers for making arrangements for the Committee to meet in St Davids that day.

**NOTED.**

