

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Reply to Moylegrove residents - TO/SG/05802/26
Date: 13 September 2026 13:34:47

Dear [REDACTED]

We are writing to raise further significant concerns arising from the revised application documents and correspondence recently added to the public planning portal in relation to application **NP/26/0374/FUL at Crug y Mor, Moylegrove**.

The revised description of development now states:

“Completion of two part-built buildings and associated works (part retrospective); change of use of the two buildings (B1 Use Only) with the main building to be a managed flexible office/workspace facility, the second smaller building to be associated ancillary storage together with the associated parking, external works and landscaped areas.”

We had, quite naturally, understood the original proposal to involve a change of use of the site to B1, particularly given the Authority's original request for the description to refer to: “change of use of the site to B1 Use Class...”

However, the correspondence recently uploaded to the public portal (following recognition of a call in request) appears to reveal that the applicant has specifically sought to narrow the B1 use so that it applies only to the two buildings, with the surrounding land being described as merely ancillary to the B1 use.

Given the contentious planning history of this site, we believe this raises important questions which need to be answered before the application is determined.

What exactly is the intended use of the surrounding land?

We think there needs to be clarify as to exactly what use is proposed for the land surrounding the two buildings?

The applicant has not, as far as we can see, clearly explained what the surrounding plot, including the parking, upper yard, access and other external areas, will actually be used for.

This information is critical to statutory consultees and members of the public. It is difficult to properly understand or comment upon a planning proposal if a substantial part of the application site has no clearly stated operational use.

The applicant's earlier correspondence is particularly relevant. It proposed that:

“The external areas of the site, including parking, access and the upper yard, are ancillary to the B1 use of the main building and do not themselves form part of the operational use.”

That wording appears to deliberately distinguish the buildings from the surrounding land.

If that is the position, what exactly is the intended use of the surrounding land?

Conversely, if those external areas are intended to support the actual operation of the

business proposed for the site, then surely the nature of that operation needs to be clearly identified and assessed.

The apparent connection with an adventure centre

This becomes particularly important because we understand that the wider grant and land arrangements relating to this site are connected to the establishment and operation of an **adventure centre**, and that obtaining appropriate planning permission is an important part of those arrangements. We understand that if the site cannot be secured for the purposes and output deliveries of the grant (providing adventure activities with Adventure Beyond) then there is potential clawback of all funds including the ownership of the land. We also understand that **Adventure Beyond has a 50% interest in the relevant arrangements/business** connected with the site.

If that understanding is correct, it is difficult to understand why the current planning application does not clearly identify an adventure-centre or outdoor recreation use. Instead, the application is presented as a B1 office/workspace facility, with ancillary storage and associated parking and external areas.

This raises a very important question:

Is the application genuinely intended to provide permission for an office/workspace and ancillary storage use only, or is it intended to provide the operational base for an adventure centre?

If the latter, we believe that use should be openly identified and assessed as part of the planning application.

For example, would the proposed permission allow the site to be used for customers associated with an adventure centre to:

- arrive and park at the site;
- booking admin offices,
- meet or assemble there;
- receive briefings or instructions;
- collect or return equipment;
- have equipment stored and handled there;
- have activities commence from and return to the site; and
- otherwise use the buildings and external areas as the operational base for the adventure business?

If those activities would not be covered by the proposed B1 office/workspace use, then we would ask why the application does not clearly identify the intended use.

Potential use for adventure centre – trigger an HRA

If the intended use is adventure centre, then this would trigger an HRA. Similar to the Morawelon refusal recently – if there is insufficient information about a functional link to a protected site, this application must be refused. An HRA is particularly pertinent in this case because Adventure Beyond has been served trespass notice by National Trust and has been evidenced non-compliant with voluntary measures put in place to protect wildlife – including the Pembrokeshire Marine Code of Conduct and NRW advised restricted area.

Adventure Beyond has caused confirmed disturbance to wildlife.

Potential “Trojan horse” concern

Taken together, these circumstances raise a serious concern for us as members of the public that the current B1 proposal could potentially become a **“Trojan horse”** for a subsequent adventure-centre use.

We are not asserting that this is necessarily the applicant's intention as a matter of fact. Our concern is that permission could be obtained for what is presented to the Authority and the public as an office/workspace and ancillary storage development, while the wider site could subsequently be used to operate an adventure centre.

If that is not the intention, then there should be no difficulty in the applicant and Authority clearly confirming that the proposed permission would **not** authorise the site to operate as an adventure centre and explaining precisely what use is intended for the surrounding land. If, on the other hand, the intention is that the site will operate as the base for an adventure centre, then we believe that should be declared and assessed now.

Grant funding and the land position

This issue is particularly important because our understanding is that the grant and land arrangements are connected to the establishment of the adventure-centre operation and that the planning position is relevant to the continued ownership/use of the land.

If the consequence of failing to obtain the necessary planning permission is that the land or grant is subject to clawback or other recovery provisions, then there is an obvious reason why the precise scope of the planning permission matters.

The public should therefore be able to understand whether the planning application actually delivers the use for which the grant and land arrangements were established.

If a B1 office/storage permission would not permit the adventure-centre operation, then it is difficult to understand how such a permission could satisfy the underlying purpose of the grant and land arrangements.

Conversely, if the B1 permission is intended to facilitate the adventure-centre operation, then that intended use should be made clear within the planning application.

Is the application sufficiently clear and properly assessable?

If the change of use of the surrounding land is not included within the declared B1 use, this raises a further question as to whether the description of development and supporting information are sufficiently comprehensive for the application to be properly assessed and determined.

How can the Authority properly assess the planning impacts of the development without knowing what the surrounding land is actually intended to be used for?

It also raises the question of whether the correct statutory consultees and other interested parties have been identified.

Different uses can give rise to very different planning considerations, impacts and consultation requirements.

We are asking that the Authority and Welsh Government satisfy themselves that the application is sufficiently clear and complete to enable the actual proposed development

to be properly assessed.

Late publication and the consultation period

There is also a significant timing issue.

The consultation is currently due to close on **17 September**, yet the correspondence which appears to clarify that the B1 use is being restricted to the two buildings, and which consequently raises questions about the use of the surrounding land, was only added to the public portal on **11 September**.

This is potentially important new information.

Members of the public were critical of PCNPA previous last-minute changes on the portal for the adventure hub which were confusing for residents, and it appears this is occurring again.

Members of the public who have already considered the application may quite reasonably have understood the proposal differently, particularly given the Authority's original wording referring to a change of use of the **site** to B1.

We therefore respectfully ask whether the consultation should be extended and/or consultees re-consulted so that statutory consultees and members of the public have a proper opportunity to consider this newly published information.

We also ask whether additional consultees should be consulted once the actual intended use of the whole site has been clarified.

We respectfully request clarification on the following

We would be grateful if the Welsh Ministers and the Authority could establish and clarify:

1. **Exactly what use is proposed for the land surrounding the two buildings;**
2. **Whether the proposed permission would allow the site to operate as the base for an adventure centre;**
3. **Whether customers, equipment, vehicles and staff associated with an adventure-centre operation would be permitted to use the site;**
4. **What interest Adventure Beyond has in the relevant business, land or arrangements, including the reported 50% interest;**
5. **Whether the grant and land arrangements require the site to obtain planning permission capable of supporting an adventure-centre operation;**
6. **Whether the current description of development accurately reflects the applicant's actual intended use of the site as a whole;**
7. **Whether the application can properly be assessed and consulted upon when the use of the surrounding land has not been clearly identified;**
8. **Whether the information published on 11 September constitutes a material clarification which warrants further consultation; and**
9. **Whether the consultation period should therefore be extended and/or statutory and other consultees re-consulted.**

We believe these matters require particular scrutiny given the planning history of the site, the apparent connection with an adventure-centre operation, the reported interest of Adventure Beyond, and the relationship between the planning application and the wider

grant and land arrangements.

Our concern is not simply about the wording of the application.

It is about ensuring that any planning permission, if granted, accurately reflects and properly assesses the **actual use intended for the site**, rather than presenting a limited B1 office/storage proposal now and leaving potentially significant aspects of the site's operational use to be introduced or interpreted later.

While the Planning Statement seeks to present this as a benign, low-impact Class B1 (Class E(g)) office development with "no effect" on the surrounding area, the Authority is legally bound by the **"Principle of Reality"** established in UK planning law. The Authority must assess the *objective reality* and true operational intent of the development, rather than taking the applicant's self-serving paper description at face value.

We respectfully ask that this correspondence is placed on the relevant planning file and taken into consideration before the application is determined.

Kind regards,

Moylgrove

On Thu, Sep 10, 2026 at 9:36 AM [REDACTED] wrote:

Concerned residents of Moylgrove,

Thank you for providing the information relating to your request for the Welsh Ministers to call in this application for their own determination.

Your request is under consideration.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Y Gyfarwyddiaeth Gynllunio | Planning Directorate

Llywodraeth Cymru | Welsh Government

Parc Cathays | Cathays Park

Caerdydd | Cardiff

CF10 3NQ

Ebost | E-mail: [REDACTED]

Rydym yn croesawu derbyn gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn ateb gohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.

We welcome receiving correspondence in Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 07 September 2026 14:38

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Reply to Moylegrove residents - TO/SG/05802/26

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for giving the opportunity to explain again why we believe this requires a call in, and why we believe that our call -in request fulfills 5 of the six considerations,

The previous application received so many local objections - enough to be considered material in the planning process.

This new application also is receiving much concern from residents.

Please find attached 2 letters regarding reply to your email.

Concerned residents of Moylgrove.

On Wed, Sep 2, 2026 at 8:23 AM [REDACTED] wrote:

Residents of Moyelgrove,

Thank you for your email below regarding your request for the Welsh Ministers to call-in application NP/26/0374/FUL.

As specified in a letter issued to you on 26 August by [REDACTED], the Welsh Government's policy on calling in planning applications is set out in paragraph 1.35 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024) and applications will only be called in if they raise issues of more than local importance. This includes proposals which:

- are in conflict with national planning policies;
- could have wide effects beyond their immediate locality;
- may give rise to substantial controversy beyond the immediate locality;
- are likely significantly to affect sites of scientific, nature conservation or historic interest or areas of landscape importance;
- raise issues of national security; or
- raise novel planning issues.

It would be particularly useful for us if you could clearly and explicitly set out the reasons why you believe application NP/26/0374/FUL should be called in by the Welsh Ministers for determination, taking into account those matters set out in the bullet point list above against what the application is seeking planning permission for.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Y Gyfarwyddiaeth Gynllunio | Planning Directorate

Llywodraeth Cymru | Welsh Government

Parc Cathays | Cathays Park

Caerdydd | Cardiff

CF10 3NQ

Ebost | E-mail: [REDACTED]

Rydym yn croesawu derbyn gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn ateb gohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi.

We welcome receiving correspondence in Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 28 August 2026 12:48

To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Reply to Moylegrove residents - TO/SG/05802/26

Dear Minister,

Thank you for your reply and for explaining the reasons for the decision not to call in planning application NP/26/0374/FUL.

We respectfully disagree again with the decision and ask that it be reconsidered. We will try to keep this brief, but there are several important matters which we believe have not been adequately addressed.

1. The previous call-in decision and the Judicial Review – our concerns were proved right

Your response refers to the previous decision not to call in application NP/24/0198/FUL in 2024.

We respectfully disagree with that decision. The concerns we raised at the time were subsequently proved to be justified. The planning permission was successfully challenged through Judicial Review and was quashed because of issues concerning the wider effects of the development.

The previous call-in decision stated:

“Given the scale and nature of the proposed development I am content that the effects of the development do not significantly extend beyond the local area. The scheme is not likely to affect sites of scientific, nature conservation or historic interest, or areas of landscape importance.”

We therefore do not believe it is appropriate to rely on that previous decision as a reason not to call in the current application. The Judicial Review showed that the concerns we raised about the wider effects of the development could not simply be dismissed as matters of purely local significance.

We believe the same issue arises again. The current proposal could potentially affect areas of SSSI and SAC, and therefore we are concerned that the very problem which arose with the previous application has not gone away.

In short, we raised concerns about the wider environmental effects in 2024, and the subsequent Judicial Review showed that those concerns were not unfounded. We believe that history should be given proper weight when considering whether the current application should be called in.

2. The proposed use – greater scrutiny is needed

We are particularly concerned by the statement in your response:

“There is no evidence in the application submission and the accompanying documentation to suggest the proposed development and use would be linked to an outdoor adventure centre with activities undertaken off site.”

With respect, we believe too much weight is being placed on the applicant’s description of the proposed use.

There are clear financial and contractual links between the development, the grant funding and Adventure Beyond. The agreement between Consulting AM and Adventure Beyond specifically describes the project as a “community outdoor activities hub”, with Adventure Beyond responsible for providing the outdoor activities. Given these links, we believe the proposed use requires greater scrutiny than simply relying on the description contained in the current planning application by the applicant.

Our concern is not simply what the applicant says the building will be used for today, but what it could realistically be used for once it is built. The proposed flexible workspace, meeting rooms and storage could potentially provide a base for briefings, administration, equipment storage and preparation for outdoor activities taking place elsewhere.

We therefore do not believe there is sufficient certainty to conclude that the building could not support an outdoor adventure operation in some form.

Given the history of the proposal, the previous Judicial Review, the environmental concerns, the public funding and the contractual links with Adventure Beyond, we believe this warrants much greater scrutiny. Relying solely on the applicant’s stated intentions **could carry a risk of significant reputational and public-interest consequences** if the building were later used in a way that differed from the basis on which the application was considered.

3. Public funding and what happens to the building

We also have serious concerns about the public funding behind this project.

The FOI correspondence from the funding manager at Pembrokeshire County Council is particularly concerning. It says the project had to be delivered at a “fairly breakneck pace”, while acknowledging that the exact costs and what could ultimately be delivered were not fully known. More importantly, it states that the redevelopment must be “capable of delivering the output and outcome targets (even if it does not do so).”

The grant has now been fully released. This raises a simple question: **what safeguards are now in place to ensure the building actually delivers the purpose for which the public money was provided?**

If the building is approved and shown to be capable of supporting adventure activities, what would prevent it being sold or used for something completely different? The agreement between Consulting AM and Adventure Beyond already contains provisions for the property to be sold.

We are not suggesting this is the applicant’s intention. We are asking what protections are actually in place to safeguard public money.

Given that the previous planning permission was quashed following Judicial Review, including environmental concerns, we believe the funding history, the links with Adventure Beyond and the future use of the building all warrant greater scrutiny.

Wider concerns – potential environmental impacts beyond this site

Separately, we understand that the National Trust has served Adventure Beyond with a trespass notice. There are also concerns regarding non-compliance and alleged contraventions affecting local residents, including potential environmental impacts.

Our concern is that if activities supported by this development take place at other locations, including environmentally sensitive sites, there must be effective means of ensuring that those activities are properly controlled and compliant. If enforcement action cannot be effectively taken where a provider is found to be non-compliant, this raises much wider questions about how SSSIs, SACs and other protected sites are being safeguarded.

Call in request -

Taken together, the previous Judicial Review, the environmental concerns, the public funding, the “breakneck” timetable, the contractual relationship with Adventure Beyond, the uncertainty over the building’s future use and these wider concerns make this much more than a simple local planning matter.

There is significant continued interest from environmental groups and the mainstream media in Wales and beyond. We believe all these issues need to be considered together, rather than separately.

We respectfully ask the Minister to reconsider the decision not to call in this application and to consider the wider implications for the environment and

the protection of public money and the reputational risks of authorities concerned.

We felt our concerns were not properly heard before, but the Judicial Review showed they were not unfounded. We hope they will be given proper consideration this time, helping to avoid further environmental, legal or reputational risks.

Regards

Moylgrove

On Thu, Aug 27, 2026 at 4:42 PM [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Concerned residents of Moylgrove

Thank you for your email of 26 August asking for a reconsideration of the decision not to call in application NP/26/0374/FUL for determination by the Welsh Ministers.

The original application for proposed development at the site (NP/24/0198/FUL), explicitly sought planning permission for a proposed building and change of use to an outdoor adventure centre with supporting documentation setting out how the proposed building would be used as a base and storage, with activities being undertaken off site. Requests were received to call in the application from residents of the Moylgrove and Ceibwr Communities. After careful consideration it was decided that the application should not be called in and a Decision Letter issued to Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority, the Planning Authority (PA), on 3 October 2024. I attach for information, a copy of the Decision Letter which sets out some of the main issues raised and the consideration of those issues. As you are aware, the decision to grant planning permission was quashed following a successful Judicial Review challenge.

This new application (NP/26/0374/FUL) seeks planning permission to complete development of the buildings which were started as part of the first application and a change of use to B1, with the main building being a flexible office / workspace facility and the second building being used for ancillary storage.

There is no evidence in the application submission and the accompanying documentation to suggest the proposed development and use would be linked to an outdoor adventure centre with activities undertaken off site. Moreover, the application states the buildings would include communal workspaces, bookable rooms for meetings, studying etc. and would be used by sole traders, small businesses, consultants, researchers etc. where all users of the facility would have to be registered members, or business visitors accompanying a registered member. It would be managed through an electronic booking system and a digital entry system. It also confirms no general public access, drop-in use or unmanaged attendance. Therefore, I confirm that the reasons for call in suggested do not meet the call-in criteria and that your call-in request will not be taken forward.

Responsibility for determining the application rests with the PA and it remains open to you to share your views on the proposal with it. These comments must be taken into account by Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority when it decides whether or not to approve the application.

Cangen Gwaith Achos Cynllunio - Planning Casework Branch

Cyfarwyddiaeth Llywodraeth Leol a Chynllunio - Local Government and Planning Directorate

Llywodraeth Cymru - Welsh Government

Parc Cathays - Cathays Park

Caerdydd, CF10 3NQ - Cardiff, CF10 3NQ

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 26 August 2026 15:46

To: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: Reply to Moylegrove residents - TO/SG/05802/26

Dear Minister,

URGENT REQUEST TO RECONSIDER THE DECISION NOT TO CALL IN NP/26/0374/FUL

We respectfully ask Welsh Ministers to reconsider the decision of 26 August 2026 not to call in the Crug y Môr/ Adventure Hub/ Old Bus Depot planning application at Moylegrove.

Your response states that our reasons do not meet the call-in criteria. We respectfully disagree. When the evidence is considered against the criteria set out in Planning Policy Wales, this application engages **at least five of the six relevant considerations**.

1. Conflict with national planning policies

The previous Crug y Môr/ Adventure Hub permission was quashed following Judicial Review, including concerns relating to NRW information and the Aberarth-Carreg Wylan SSSI.

The current application now asserts that there is **"no functional connection"** with European protected sites. However, the documentary evidence raises a material question about that conclusion.

The original publicly funded project was expressly conceived as a **community outdoor activities hub**, with Adventure Beyond responsible for delivering the outdoor activities. The agreement between Consulting AM Ltd and Adventure Beyond Ltd confirms this relationship.

It is therefore necessary to establish whether the proposed building, including its proposed equipment storage and business use, is functionally connected with outdoor activities undertaken elsewhere and whether those activities could affect protected sites.

This is a national planning-policy issue, not simply a local objection.

2. Wide effects beyond the immediate locality

The potential effects cannot necessarily be confined to the building at Crug y Môr.

If the building is used to support Adventure Beyond's outdoor activities, those activities **may take place at locations elsewhere in Pembrokeshire and beyond, potentially involving SSSIs, SACs and other environmentally sensitive areas**.

The planning question is therefore potentially wider than the immediate locality of Moylegrove.

It concerns how a development at one location facilitates activities and environmental effects elsewhere within the National Park and potentially beyond.

3. Substantial controversy beyond the immediate locality

This is not an ordinary local planning dispute.

The project has already resulted in a successful Judicial Review and the quashing of the previous planning permission. It has generated significant community concern, wider public and continued intense media interest and involvement from elected representatives and has potential for reputational damage to PCNP and PCC.

The controversy also concerns the use of substantial public funds and the planning status and future use of a publicly supported asset.

There is intense media scrutiny – that continues with regard to the grant funding and the environmental concerns at local and national level.

This is therefore a **matter of public interest extending far beyond a disagreement between neighbouring residents** and a local applicant.

4. Likely significant effects on sites of scientific or nature-conservation interest and areas of landscape importance

This is perhaps the most significant issue.

The application is within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park and raises questions concerning the **Aberarth-Carreg Wylan SSSI, SACs and other protected sites**, as well as National Park landscape and seascape qualities.

Given the previous Judicial Review and the outstanding question of the functional relationship between the proposed building and Adventure Beyond's outdoor activities, **there is a real issue as to whether the environmental effects have been properly identified and assessed.**

The potential consequences of allowing an adventure-tourism operation to be supported from this location could extend beyond the physical footprint of the building.

5. Novel planning issues

This application presents an unusual combination of circumstances:

- a previous planning permission has been quashed by the High Court;
- the current proposal is substantially retrospective;
- an Enforcement Warning Notice has been issued;
- the building is publicly funded and remains incomplete;
- the original project was a joint initiative involving Adventure Beyond's outdoor activities;
- Adventure Beyond has a documented **50% financial interest** in the property and an entitlement to 50% of net sale proceeds;
- approximately **£518,000 of UK Shared Prosperity Fund money** has been invested;
- the Council's audit has identified concerns regarding project evolution,

delivery, value for money, long-term benefits, stakeholder engagement and reputational risk; and

- the current planning application asserts no functional connection with European protected sites despite the documented relationship between the building and Adventure Beyond's outdoor activities.

The interaction between these matters creates an **unusual and potentially novel planning issue** which warrants consideration beyond the normal local planning process.

The public-funding dimension

We also believe the public-interest dimension deserves particular consideration.

The CAM/Adventure Beyond agreement confirms that Adventure Beyond has a 50% financial interest in the property and that, subject to the agreement, the parties are entitled to divide net sale proceeds equally.

We are **not alleging wrongdoing**.

However, where more than half a million pounds of public funding has been invested in an asset which has a private contractual financial interest attached to it, there is an obvious wider public-interest question concerning the relationship between the planning permission, the intended purpose of the grant, the future use of the asset and the protection of public investment.

The Council's own audit findings make this issue particularly difficult to characterise as merely a local planning dispute.

An **FOI-released PCC email** says the UKSPF project only needed to be *capable* of delivering its agreed outcomes, even if it did not actually do so.

Could the building therefore be completed as an “adventure centre”, without the activities being delivered, then sold or changed to private workspace?

Given the public funds involved, this should be clarified before the planning decision.

Our request

We respectfully ask Welsh Ministers to reconsider the decision not to call in NP/26/0374/FUL.

We are not asking Ministers to prejudge whether planning permission should ultimately be granted or refused.

We are asking Ministers to recognise that this application engages **multiple express call-in considerations**, including national planning policy, effects beyond the immediate locality, substantial wider controversy, protected sites and landscape, and novel planning issues.

The timing also makes this matter particularly urgent. The Senedd's confirmed summer recess runs from 20 July to 13 September 2026, with Senedd business resuming on 15 September. The proposed 14 September determination date therefore falls immediately before the Senedd returns. In these circumstances, **and**

given the exceptional combination of public funding, environmental implications, previous Judicial Review, media scrutiny, and wider public controversy, we respectfully ask that Welsh Ministers ensure that the call-in question is resolved before the application can be determined.

We would be grateful for a substantive response explaining the reasoning and evidence underlying the decision.

Yours sincerely,

Concerned residents of Moylegrove

On Wed, Aug 26, 2026 at 10:38 AM wrote:

I attach a reply to your email of 23 August.

Cangen Gwaith Achos Cynllunio - Planning Casework Branch

Cyfarwyddiaeth Llywodraeth Leol a Chynllunio - Local Government and Planning Directorate

Llywodraeth Cymru - Welsh Government

Parc Cathays - Cathays Park

Caerdydd, CF10 3NQ - Cardiff, CF10 3NQ

Sganiwyd y neges hon am bob feirws hysbys wrth iddi adael Llywodraeth Cymru. Mae Llywodraeth Cymru yn cymryd o ddifrif yr angen i ddiogelu eich data. Os cysylltwch â Llywodraeth Cymru, mae ein hysbysiad preifatrwydd yn esbonio sut rydym yn defnyddio eich gwybodaeth a sut rydym yn diogelu eich preifatrwydd. Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn anfon ateb yn Gymraeg i ohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi. ----- On leaving the Welsh Government this email was scanned for all known viruses. The Welsh Government takes the protection of your data seriously. If you contact the Welsh Government then our [Privacy Notice](#) explains how we use your information and the ways in which we protect your privacy. We welcome receiving correspondence in Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

Sganiwyd y neges hon am bob feirws hysbys wrth iddi adael Llywodraeth Cymru. Mae Llywodraeth Cymru yn cymryd o ddifrif yr angen i ddiogelu eich data. Os cysylltwch â Llywodraeth Cymru, mae ein hysbysiad preifatrwydd yn esbonio sut rydym yn defnyddio eich gwybodaeth a sut rydym yn diogelu eich preifatrwydd. Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn anfon ateb yn Gymraeg i ohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi. ----- On leaving the Welsh Government this email was scanned for all known viruses. The Welsh Government takes the protection of your data seriously. If you contact the Welsh Government then our [Privacy Notice](#) explains how we use your information and the ways in which we protect your privacy. We welcome receiving correspondence in Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a

| delay in responding.

Sganiwyd y neges hon am bob feirws hysbys wrth iddi adael Llywodraeth Cymru. Mae Llywodraeth Cymru yn cymryd o ddifrif yr angen i ddiogelu eich data. Os cysylltwch â Llywodraeth Cymru, mae ein hysbysiad preifatrwydd yn esbonio sut rydym yn defnyddio eich gwybodaeth a sut rydym yn diogelu eich preifatrwydd. Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn anfon ateb yn Gymraeg i ohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi. ----- On leaving the Welsh Government this email was scanned for all known viruses. The Welsh Government takes the protection of your data seriously. If you contact the Welsh Government then our [Privacy Notice](#) explains how we use your information and the ways in which we protect your privacy. We welcome receiving correspondence in Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.

Sganiwyd y neges hon am bob feirws hysbys wrth iddi adael Llywodraeth Cymru. Mae Llywodraeth Cymru yn cymryd o ddifrif yr angen i ddiogelu eich data. Os cysylltwch â Llywodraeth Cymru, mae ein hysbysiad preifatrwydd yn esbonio sut rydym yn defnyddio eich gwybodaeth a sut rydym yn diogelu eich preifatrwydd. Rydym yn croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg. Byddwn yn anfon ateb yn Gymraeg i ohebiaeth a dderbynnir yn Gymraeg ac ni fydd gohebu yn Gymraeg yn arwain at oedi. ----- On leaving the Welsh Government this email was scanned for all known viruses. The Welsh Government takes the protection of your data seriously. If you contact the Welsh Government then our [Privacy Notice](#) explains how we use your information and the ways in which we protect your privacy. We welcome receiving correspondence in Welsh. Any correspondence received in Welsh will be answered in Welsh and corresponding in Welsh will not lead to a delay in responding.