

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT MANAGER ON APPEALS

The following appeals have been lodged with the Authority and the current position of each is as follows:-

EC21/0081 Unauthorised signage – Land to south of Blockett Farm, Blockett Lane, Little Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire SA62 3UH
Type Written Reps
Current Position The initial documentation has been forwarded to Pedw

EC21/0145 Construction of new access and access track; erection of timber cabin for residential use; storing of touring caravan; storing of converted van type vehicle; erection of solar panels & erection of tented canopy - Land OS Parcel No. 1050, known as Pwllau Clau, Crosswell, Crymych, Pembrokeshire, SA41 3SA
Type Written Reps
Current Position The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW

EC22/0038 Siting of Camping Pod and associated drainage work - Land to the north of Pentop, Abercastle, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 5HJ
Type Written Reps
Current Position The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW

EC22/0088 Unauthorised siting of polytunnel - Land at Llwyndrain Forest, Pentregalar, Crymych, Pembrokeshire, SA66 7SB
Type Written Reps
Current Position The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW

EC23/0124 Siting of touring caravan on land for residential use - Penygraig Uchaf, Cippyn, St. Dogmaels, Pembrokeshire, SA43 3LZ
Type Written Reps
Current Position The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW

NP/24/0440/FUL Design amendment to approval NP/21/0133/FUL & NP/22/0701/NMA with alternative front Steps / ramp, new rear disabled lift & position of roof lights (In Retrospect) Sands Café, Newgale Hill, Newgale SA62 6AS
Type Written Reps
Current Position The appeal has been partially dismissed & partially allowed and a copy of the Inspectors decision along with the Costs decision are attached for your information

NP/24/0472/FUL Partially retrospective application for the siting of pod (caravan), hot tub, pergola, decking, solar panels and drainage system associated with holiday use of the site, as replacement of former cabin - Land East of Bryntirion Lodge, Cippyn, St Dogmaels, Pembrokeshire, SA43 3LS

Type Written Reps

Current Position The appeal has been dismissed and a copy of the Inspectors decision is attached for your information.

NP/25/0066/FUL Existing shed replaced with summerhouse for holiday let accommodation - 19a, Wesley Road, Little Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3UJ

Type Written Reps

Current Position The initial documentation has been sent to PEDW



Appeal Decision

by R H Duggan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 02/10/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04241-F5B0J3

Site address: Sands Café, Newgale Hill, Newgale, Haverfordwest SA62 6AS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bruce Sanderson against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/24/0440/FUL, dated 5 August 2024, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as *“Design amendment to Approval NP/21/1033/FUL & NP/22/0701/NMA with alternative front steps/ramp, new rear disabled lift and position of roof lights in retrospect”*.
 - A site visit was made on 12 September 2025.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front steps/ramp. The appeal is allowed, however, insofar as it relates to the remainder of the application and planning permission is granted for the design amendment to Approval NP/21/1033/FUL & NP/22/0701/NMA with new rear disabled lift and position of roof lights at Sands Café, Newgale Hill, Newgale, Haverfordwest SA62 6AS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: NP/24/0440/FUL, dated 5 August 2024, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. On 9 March 2022 planning permission was granted for a “Rebuild, increase in floor level and roof height and alternative front & rear disabled access (partially retrospective)” (LPA Reference: NP/21/1033/FUL). Subsequently, a non-material amendment application to change the main roof material was granted on 12 January 2023 (LPA Reference: NP/22/0701/NMA).
3. The development subject to this appeal seeks permission for an amended design to the above planning permissions to include the front steps/ramp into the cafe, a new rear disabled lift and revised position of the roof lights. It is clear from the evidence and my site visit that construction work for these elements of the development have already been undertaken on the appeal building. As such I have determined the appeal on the basis that it seeks retrospective consent under the terms of Section 73A(2)(a) of the 1990 Act.

4. Objections have been raised regarding the position of the roof lights and the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy within neighbouring properties. The Authority has not raised any concerns in this regard, subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the use of the internal mezzanine and the use of obscure glazing. I have not been provided with evidence that would lead me to reach a different conclusion.
5. Therefore, the Council's only concerns with the scheme relate to the highway safety implications caused by the front steps and ramp.

Main Issue

6. I consider the main issue to be the impact of the development on highway safety.

Reasons

7. Sands Cafe is located in Newgale on the A487 with Newgale beach being one of North Pembrokeshire's most popular coastal attractions extending along 2 miles of beach and pebble bank. It is clear that the café has been subject to significant renovation and improvement works over recent years and is a very popular destination for visitors.
8. The most recent construction works included the creation of a timber structure to the front of the café's main entrance providing a disabled ramp access and steps. The Authority is concerned that the combined stair and ramp arrangement projects into the adopted public highway and creates a dangerous obstruction in the highway and reduces pedestrian safety. In objecting to the as built development, the Authority has referred me to the various planning applications at the site over recent years and the consistent advice that it has provided to the appellant regarding the design and siting of the access stairs and ramp and its concerns regarding the width of the pavement.
9. The Authority's evidence provides on-site measurements undertaken by the County Highways Authority (CHA) which indicate that the ramp width is 1.1 metres with a length of 5.5 metres and the turning space between the café wall and the base of the ramp is 1.26 metres, which results in the remaining footway width at the narrowest point being reduced to 1.0 metre. These measurements have not been questioned by the appellant, and no counter measurements have been provided. The Authority confirms that the measurements undertaken by the CHA fall short of national standards included within Inclusive Mobility (DfT 2021) and Manual for Streets.
10. During my site visit I observed that Newgale was very busy with visitors, and I saw that the footpath outside the café was busy with customers visiting the café and the adjacent hardware store, as well as walkers using the coastal footpath. I also observed that the adjoining road (the A487) was very busy with passing cars and larger vehicles, a number of which were forced to stop in the road to allow pedestrians to manoeuvre along this narrow stretch of highway. Indeed, the Authority's statement of case includes evidence relating to the speed and volume of traffic passing through Newgale, and this confirms my observations.
11. I agree with the appellant that the combined stair and ramp arrangement provides inclusive and accessible access for people with reduced mobility, children and elderly visitors. Nevertheless, due to the layout and design of the structure it reduces the usable width of the pavement for pedestrians. Given the high level of footfall along this stretch of the pavement and the overall length of the reduced width of pavement, it has a detrimental effect on the free-flow of pedestrians along this stretch. During particularly busy periods during the summer months, the reduction in pavement width could result in pedestrians, wheelchair users and those with pushchairs having to step into the road where they could come into conflict with vehicles, which would represent a severe risk to

pedestrian safety. This risk is exacerbated by the presence of the nearby bridge, the bend in the road and the high level of vehicular traffic passing the appeal site.

12. The appellant argues that there are examples of this arrangement found throughout Pembrokeshire, but I have not been provided with any evidence of these examples. Therefore, I attribute this matter no weight in my assessment and, in any event, I do not consider that they would represent any form of precedent that would weigh in favour of the appeal.
13. The combination of the narrowed section of pedestrian footway with high levels of vehicle movements creates an unacceptable level of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. Therefore, I find that the combined stair and ramp arrangement to the front of the cafe represents a severe risk to highway safety contrary to Policies 1, 6, 30 and 60 of the Adopted Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (LDP) 2020.

Other Matters

14. The Authority and the appellant have provided evidence relating to the ownership of the land. Whilst I have had regard to this issue, the ownership of the land is not a matter that has had any influence on the conclusions that I have made above.

Conditions

15. Guidance in relation to the use of conditions is set out in Welsh Government Circular 016/2014: The Use of Planning Conditions for Development Management. The Council submitted a list of draft conditions with reasons and these conditions are set out, with reasons, in the schedule of conditions. I have adjusted the wording of some of the conditions in the interest of clarity and precision. They are necessary and seek to ensure that the development avoids, or where that is not possible, mitigates as far as is reasonable, the potentially harmful effects of the development, alongside securing enhancements as sought by national policy.

Conclusions

16. I have taken into account all matters raised by the appellant and those interested parties objecting to the development. However, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the front steps/ramp, but the remainder of the development, namely the provision of the new rear disabled lift and revised position of roof lights are acceptable, and I shall allow these elements of the development subject to the schedule of conditions attached to this decision.
17. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives of building a stronger, greener economy as we make maximum progress towards decarbonisation, making our cities, towns and villages even better places in which to live and work and embedding our response to the climate and nature emergency in everything we do.

R. Duggan

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than five years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with Sections 91 and 93 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: P01C Location Plan; P02E Proposed NW and SE Elevations; P03E Proposed NE and SW Elevations; P04E Proposed Ground Floor Plan; P05D Proposed Site/Block Plan & Typical Section; Planning report & Green Infrastructure Statement Rev A.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

- 3) Within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for biodiversity enhancement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Planning Policy Wales Edition 12, February 2024.

- 4) The external under-canopy, terrace and garden customer seating areas at the premises shall not be used by customers between the hours of 21:00pm and 07:00am on any day.

Reason: To protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents in accordance with Local Development Plan 2 Policy 30 (Amenity).

- 5) The internal mezzanine level shall at all times be used for commercial storage purposes only, and shall not at any time be used for additional customer seating, and shall remain as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents in accordance with Local Development Plan 2 Policy 30 (Amenity).

- 6) The 4 no. north-eastern-most rooflights on each front and rear roof slope shall be obscured glazed to a minimum of level 3 on the Pilkington scale of obscurity and shall be non-opening and shall be retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents in accordance with Local Development Plan 2 Policy 30 (Amenity).

- 7) Within 3 months of this decision, full details of the disabled access lift at the rear which should include its type, junction with other surfacing, heights of surfacing and ramp features in order to safely achieve rear access, should be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The disabled access lift shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal satisfies national standards for inclusive and safe access and aligns with the Equality Act 2010 (Disability). Policy: Local Development Plan 2 - Policy 60 (Impacts of Traffic).



Costs Decision

by R H Duggan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 02/10/2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: CAS-04241-F5B0J3

Site address: Sands Café, Newgale Hill, Newgale, Haverfordwest SA62 6AS

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322C and Schedule 6.
 - The application is made by Mr Bruce Sanderson for a full award of costs against Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for *“Design amendment to Approval NP/21/1033/FUL & NP/22/0701/NMA with alternative front steps/ramp, new rear disabled lift and position of roof lights in retrospect”*.
 - A site visit was made by the Inspector on 12 September 2025.
-

Decision

1. The application for a full award of costs is dismissed.

Reasons

2. Section 12 Annex ‘Award of Costs’ of the Development Management Manual (‘the Annex’) advises that, irrespective of the outcome of an appeal, costs may only be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably, thereby causing the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. In terms of the advice contained within the Annex, unreasonable behaviour can be procedural i.e. relating to the process, or substantive i.e. relating to issues of substance arising from the merits of an appeal or application. In terms of a substantive award, the types of behaviour include preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted, having regard to its accordance with the development plan, national policy and any other material considerations; and the failure to produce evidence to substantiate the impact of the proposal, or each reason, or proposed reason for refusal.
3. The applicant seeks a full award of costs on the basis that the National Park Authority has acted unreasonably and has shown a consistent lack of willingness to support the development, has delayed decision-making, provided conflicting advice and failed to properly consider the viability and public benefit of the café development. The applicant goes on to argue that the Authority has applied pressure through threats of enforcement rather than working collaboratively toward lawful resolution which has resulted in loss of income, increased expense through the submission of multiple applications and legal, professional and architectural fees, construction delays and reputational damage.

4. These arguments appear to relate to the entire process of submitting various planning applications to the National Park Authority over recent years rather than specific examples of unreasonable behaviour relating to the determination of the planning application subject to the current appeal scheme. The applicant's concerns about the Authority's lack of willingness to support the development resulting in the loss of income and increased expenses is unsubstantiated and is confusing given that various planning permissions for the renovation and redevelopment of the cafe have been granted by the Authority since 2017.
5. The Authority's concerns over the effects of the combined access ramp and steps on highway safety are adequately substantiated with reference to on-site measurements, national design standards and speed and traffic volume results, as well as an objective analysis of the pedestrian and traffic conditions at the appeal site. Therefore, the Authority's assessment of this matter and its finding of harm was not unreasonable, and it has adequately substantiated the reason for refusal. Indeed, the Authority's evidence confirms, contrary to the applicant's views, that it has provided consistent advice to the applicant within recent planning applications on the matter of highway safety and the impact of the combined access ramp and steps.
6. I am satisfied on the evidence before me that the Authority has adequately substantiated its refusal reason through a sufficiently detailed and objective analysis of the impacts of the development and why it would not be acceptable, having regard to relevant development plan policies. It has exercised reasonable planning judgement when balancing the relevant benefits and disbenefits of the development, and it did not prevent or delay development which should clearly have been permitted. Consequently, I find that the applicant has not incurred unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
7. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Annex, has not been demonstrated. An award of costs is therefore not justified.

R Duggan

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

by R H Duggan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 17/11/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04253-X1X3Z6

Site address: Land east of Bryntirion Lodge, Cippyn, St Dogmaels SA43 3LS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Phillip Thomas against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/24/0472/FUL, dated 5 September 2024 was refused by notice dated 30 October 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as “partially retrospective application for the siting of pod (caravan), hot tub, pergola, decking, solar panels and drainage system associated with holiday use of the site, as replacement of former cabin”.
 - A site visit was made on 5 November 2025.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It is clear from the evidence, and my site visit that the vast majority of the development has already been constructed and completed. As such I have determined the appeal on the basis that it seeks retrospective consent under the terms of Section 73A(2)(a) of the 1990 Act.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be whether the development complies with planning policies relating to development in the countryside and sustainable development, having particular regard to its location within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park (PCNP).

Reasons

4. The development consists of a glamping pod, hot tub, pergola, raised decking and associated steps, solar panels and drainage system which are used for holiday letting purposes. The nearest dwelling is Bryntirion Lodge located adjacent to the C3109 which is a narrow, single-track road leading to Poppit Sands. The pod is located alongside a footpath and clearly visible from the public right of way.

5. For the purposes of planning policy, as identified by Policy 7 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 (LDP), the appeal site falls outside the identified Centres within the open countryside. LDP Policy 7 seeks to ensure that outside the identified Centres development is strictly controlled. It identifies forms of development that would be acceptable in principle in the countryside including, amongst other things, farm diversification, a rural enterprise dwelling or tourist attractions or recreational activity where the need to locate in the countryside is essential. This policy accords with the objectives of Planning Policy Wales Edition 12 (PPW) which seeks to ensure that development in the countryside is located within and adjoining those settlements where it can best be accommodated in terms of infrastructure, access, habitat and landscape conservation.
6. LDP policies 38 and 41 permit limited caravan, camping and chalet development away from the coast and Preselis and in locations not intervisible with them and sets out criteria for such proposals. In support of policy 41, the NPA has prepared the '*Caravan, Camping and Chalet*' Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) which assesses the capacity of the landscape and sensitivity of existing Landscape Character Areas (LCA's) in the PCNP to accommodate a range of different types of caravan, camping and chalet developments. The site lies within a Historic Landscape of the Lower Teifi Valley and within the Landscape Character Area 25 (Cemaes Head) as defined within the Landscape Character SPG. The site's LCA is identified as having high/medium sensitivity for small static sites and medium sensitivity to small seasonal sites. It also identifies limited capacity for new sites.
7. Having regard to the isolated rural location of the site and its intervisibility with the coast being located on higher ground close to Poppit Sands, the development is a sporadic form of development in the landscape, and despite the presence of mature trees, it has a harmful impact on the locality especially when viewed from the adjacent public right of way. The appellant has not demonstrated a particular essential need to be located in an isolated countryside location, consequently, the development results in an unacceptable form of development in the countryside.
8. Policies 29 and 59 of the LDP seek to ensure that proposals for development will be required to be well designed in terms of accessibility, promote sustainable travel choices and reduce the need to travel by car. These policies are in general accordance with the thrust of PPW to reduce the reliance on the private car.
9. The site has very limited access to local facilities and services, other than those found within St Dogmaels (approximately 4km away) and Cardigan (approximately 6km away). The distance separating the appeal site from these two larger settlements, combined with the narrow, unlit road and absence of pedestrian footways means that walking would not be a viable option for the occupiers of the pod, especially those with varied accessibility needs. Whilst cycling may be an option to access some facilities, the narrowness of the access road and steepness in places, and the lack of light during winter months, would limit the use of this option for most. Therefore, the occupiers of the development are likely to be heavily reliant on a car to undertake regular journeys to larger settlements on a frequent basis to access shops, public services, other essential services and to visit other holiday attractions in the wider area.
10. It is clear that tourism is a substantial sector of the Pembrokeshire economy, spreading employment and income across the County and the National Park, and the development could contribute to this and help to support local businesses in the rural countryside. However, PPW also advises that new tourism developments should aim to promote a reduction in car reliance. The current adopted LDP also sets a restrictive approach towards new purpose-built holiday accommodation in countryside locations. The appeal

development is sited within such an unsustainable and countryside location and runs counter to the overarching strategy of the adopted LDP.

11. The appellant refers to PPW paragraph 5.6.10 which states that planning authorities should '*adopt a positive approach to diversification projects in rural areas. Additional small business activities can be sustainably located on farms and provide additional income streams*'. Whilst I have noted the thrust of PPW in this regard, this scheme is an isolated development and is not associated with any established farm or other rural enterprise.
12. Therefore, in view of the main issue, the development results in an unsustainable form of development in the countryside resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. To this end, the development conflicts with LDP Policies 7, 29, 38, 41, 45 and 59 of the LDP. The development is also contrary to policies 1 and 14 of the LDP which seek to ensure that development within the NP is compatible with the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the park; and to protect the qualities and special landscape and seascape character of the PCNP.

Other Matters

13. The Appellant refers to the use of a former cabin on the site and the lawful use of the site for holiday purposes which should be a material consideration in the determination of this appeal. Whilst I have noted the evidence submitted by the appellant in this regard, whether the development is lawful or not is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is open to the appellant to apply to have the matter determined under section 191 of the Act. Any such application, or subsequent appeal, would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal.
14. The appellant also refers me to the granting of a recent grant of planning permission for two caravans at Roch (Reference NP/21/0384/FUL) and that the appeal development should be considered in a similar manner. Limited details of that case have been provided and so I am unable to gauge the extent to which the Roch development directly compares with the scheme before me. Notwithstanding this, in my experience, it is rare that direct parallels can be drawn between individual schemes because local circumstances often vary. Moreover, a central principle of the planning system is that each development should be assessed on its own merits, which I have done in this instance.

Conclusions

15. Having regard to the above and considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
16. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives of building a stronger, greener economy as we make maximum progress towards decarbonisation, making our cities, towns and villages even better places in which to live and work and embedding our response to the climate and nature emergency in everything we do.

RH Duggan

INSPECTOR