

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 appeal has been dismissed and the enforcement notice upheld and a copy of the Inspectors decision is attached for your information

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

EC22/0088 Unauthorised siting of polytunnel - Land at Llwyndrain Forest, Pentregar, 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/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 appeal has been dismissed and a copy of the Inspectors decision is attached for your information.

NP/25/0271/FUL Erection of wooden fence along part of the back garden of property (retrospective) - 34, Maes Y Cnwce, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0RS
Type Written Reps
Current Position The initial documentation is being prepared to be forwarded to PEDW

NP/24/0602/FUL Below ground extension to an ancillary building at Sleekstone House and associated landscaping - Sleekstone, Haroldston Hill, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3JP
Type Written Reps
Current Position The initial documentation is being prepared to be forwarded to PEDW

NP/24/0612/FUL Conversion of residential flat and former Public House to one residential dwelling - Taberna, Herbrandston, Milford Haven, Pembrokeshire, SA73 3TD
Type Written Reps
Current Position The initial documentation is being prepared to be forwarded to PEDW



Appeal Decision

by C D Sweet MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 29/01/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04308-L9T4N7

Site address: Land to the south of Blockett Farm, Blockett Lane, Little Haven, Pembrokeshire

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 (the Act).
 - The appeal is made by Mark Chapman against an enforcement notice issued by the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The enforcement notice, EC21/0081, was issued on 14 May 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the making of a material change of use of the land from agricultural use to a use comprising:
(i) The siting and storing of four shipping containers used for non-agricultural storage purposes; and (ii) The storage of 2 no. boat trailers and 1 no. small trailer, 1 x freestanding basketball/netball hoop, lobster pots, plastic traffic/pedestrian barriers, stell/metalwork, concrete garden planters, building material and waste material.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
(i) Cease the unauthorised use of the land for the siting and storage of the shipping containers; and (ii) Cease the unauthorised use of the land for the storage of non-agricultural equipment and materials; and (iii) Permanently remove from the land the shipping containers and all their contents stored within, and all other non-agricultural equipment and materials on the land and restore the Land to its former condition before the breach of planning control took place.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 3 months beginning with the day on which the notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(f) and (g) of the Act.
 - A site visit was made on 21 January 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is an irregular area of land situated between Blockett Farm to the north and Golygfa Hafan and Blockett View to the south.
3. The appellant suggests that one shipping container is used for storing materials in relation to ongoing works at nearby Overhaven House or could be used for similar purposes in relation to an outline planning permission (PP) at the appeal site, under permitted development rights. They have not indicated which, but I observed that the longest container is used to store a number of tools and a small amount of building materials, among other more domestic items.

4. However, I have no compelling evidence to indicate that any relevant operations are ongoing at Overhaven House, or that works in relation to the outline PP, which I acknowledge the appellant wishes to pursue, are currently being or able to be carried out. I am therefore content that all of the shipping containers form 'part and parcel' of the breach of planning control (BPC) described in the enforcement notice (the Notice).
5. Whilst I accept that it may be due to a lack of access, the other items described in the Notice are nonetheless also being stored on the site and form part of the BPC. I have dealt with the grounds of appeal accordingly.
6. The appellant states that they are willing to comply with the Notice and much of their case is predicated on an inability to do so, due to an ongoing dispute with the owner of Blockett View regarding rights of vehicular access to the appeal site from the south.
7. I fully acknowledge the history of enforcement action and issues relating to private access rights described by the appellant and other parties. However, previous action, legal issues around access rights and the motivations or behaviour of those involved are not before me in this appeal, and I therefore make no comment on them.
8. The appellant asks that I require the National Park Authority (NPA) to exercise powers under s178, s196B and s196C of the Act for the appellant to gain entry to the appeal site. Whilst such powers may be an option for achieving compliance with the Notice, exercising them is a matter for the NPA. It is not open to me to require such action in an appeal under s174. Nor am I able to facilitate assistance from the Police or offer guidance to the parties on how to proceed.

The appeal on Ground (f)

9. A ground (f) appeal is that the steps required to comply with the requirements of the notice are excessive and that lesser steps would achieve its purpose.
10. Whilst I note that Section 4 of the Notice sets out the alleged harm, its requirements, set out at Section 5, seek the cessation of the unauthorised use and the removal of the shipping containers, their contents and all other associated non-agricultural equipment and materials from the land and the reinstatement of its condition prior to the BPC. It is therefore clear that the purpose of the Notice is to remedy the BPC, rather than to address any harm to amenity.
11. Requiring the removal of all but one container would not remedy the BPC. Given the purpose of the Notice, it is unclear how it could be achieved other than by ceasing the unauthorised use and removing the facilitating items in their entirety.
12. Whilst I note the issues with vehicular access to the appeal site, they do not constitute lesser steps for the purposes of a ground (f) appeal. No alternative lesser steps that would remedy the BPC have been put forward.
13. As such, I find that the requirements of the Notice do not exceed what is necessary to remedy the BPC and the appeal on ground (f) therefore fails.

The appeal on Ground (g)

14. A ground (g) appeal is that the time given to comply with the requirements of the Notice is too short. The appellant seeks an extended period of 6-12 months, to allow time for the necessary items to be removed, once vehicular access to the site has been obtained.
15. It was clear at my visit that, other than the access to the south of the appeal site, there are no other accesses that are likely to be feasible for compliance without permission from the owner of Blockett Farm, which the appellant states cannot be obtained.

16. However, notwithstanding issues that may have arisen previously, the owner of Blockett View has indicated their agreement with the NPA's taking of enforcement action and the requirement to remove the items facilitating the unauthorised use.
17. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's concerns in this respect, given that the owner of Blockett View objects to the presence of the shipping containers and other items on the land, it is reasonable to assume that they would not seek to impede access to enable compliance with the Notice and the resolution of their concerns in this respect.
18. In any event, the purpose of the compliance period is to allow the time necessary for the steps required by the Notice to be undertaken, rather than to allow for the resolution of matters which fall outside the remit of planning control. Three months is a sufficient period for cessation of the unauthorised use and the physical removal of the necessary items, and I am mindful that there are other mechanisms available to the NPA if, for any reason, the Notice is not complied with in the required period.
19. I therefore find that the 3 month period for compliance represents an appropriate and proportionate balance between the relevant public and private interests in this case. The appeal on ground (g) fails.

Conclusion

20. I have considered all other matters raised, but none lead me away from my findings that the appeal should be dismissed and the enforcement notice upheld.
21. 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 one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives.

C D Sweet

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

by C MacFarlane BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 06/02/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04403-G9C0F2

Site address: 19A Wesley Road, Little Haven, Haverfordwest SA62 3UJ

- 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 Miss Shabnam Banihashem against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The application NP/25/0066/FUL, dated 4 February 2025, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2025.
 - The development proposed is existing shed replaced with summerhouse for holiday let accommodation.
 - A site visit was made on 28 January 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and future occupiers of the proposal, with regard to noise and privacy, and (ii) the character of the Little Haven Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a small area of land within the rear garden of 19A Wesley Road, part of which is currently occupied by a timber shed. The site is located within the Little Haven Conservation Area (CA) and the wider Pembrokeshire Coast National Park.

Living conditions

4. Whilst the proposal may result in use of the adjoining patio area by the future occupiers for sitting outside, this area is currently able to be used by the occupiers of No. 19A in the same manner. As such, there would be little additional noise and disturbance, particularly given the small size of the proposal would limit the number of occupiers, and the existing noise from nearby gardens and properties associated with a residential area. The proposal would therefore not result in significant harm in relation to noise and disturbance.

5. Views between the proposal and adjoining patio area, and neighbouring properties windows and gardens, would be oblique and largely screened by existing boundary treatments, such that any additional overlooking would be limited and not harmful to privacy.
6. Views between the proposal and the first-floor patio doors in the rear elevation of No. 19A, which serve a bedroom, and the modest external amenity area accessed from the doors would, however, be direct and at close range. The significantly higher ground level would exacerbate the overlooking effect from the proposal into these areas of the host dwelling. The proposal would therefore materially reduce privacy for the occupiers of No. 19A and would also be detrimental to the privacy of the occupiers of the summerhouse.
7. In conclusion, the proposal would be acceptable with regards to living conditions in relation to noise but would be unacceptable in relation to privacy and therefore would fail to comply with Policy 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 (LDP), which prevents development where it has an unacceptable adverse effect on amenity.

Conservation Area

8. The Little Haven CA Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) notes that the character of Little Haven is intrinsically linked to its history and development, being of outstanding historical importance, within a deep valley and fine coastal setting, and predominantly 19th century buildings. The SPG recognises traffic management issues as a negative factor in the CA, including peak-time congestion and vehicle/pedestrian conflict. It also states that where possible, the visual impact of parked vehicles on the streetscape and landscape setting of historic streets and buildings should be minimised.
9. No vehicle parking would be provided as part of the proposal and, given the narrow width and parking restrictions along the length of Wesley Road, which is a no-through road, occupiers of the summerhouse travelling by private vehicle would be required to park away from the site.
10. Whilst much of the surrounding roads are subject to similar restrictions which limit on-street parking availability, the public car park is a short walk from the appeal site and, in the absence of any evidence that this would not be available to visitors, would provide adequate parking facilities.
11. Although on-street parking opportunities along Wesley Road are severely limited, many properties have some off-street parking provision. As such, the road presently experiences vehicle movements associated with these properties. Given the small scale of the proposal, the additional vehicle numbers and movements that may be generated, both along Wesley Road and within the surrounding area, would be minimal, such that the character of the CA would be preserved.
12. The SPG also highlights the use of inappropriate modern materials as a negative factor within the CA, and I observed several examples along Wesley Road. However, there would be negligible views of the proposal from nearby public vantage points due to surrounding topography and built form, which the Authority recognises in its submissions. I also note the appellant's willingness to accept a condition requiring approval of alternative external materials. On this basis, the proposal would not be visually harmful and would preserve the character of the CA.
13. The proposal would therefore accord with LDP Policy 8, which seeks to ensure the special qualities of the National Park will be conserved and enhanced, with a priority to

ensure the historic environment is protected and where possible enhanced. It would also comply with LDP Policy 14, which prevents unacceptable adverse effects on the qualities and special landscape and seascape character of the National Park, including locally distinctive characteristics, and LDP Policy 29, which requires an integrated approach to design and construction.

Other Matters

14. I note the lack of objection from neighbouring occupiers. However, an absence of objection does not render a proposal acceptable, and I therefore afford this consideration little weight.
15. In reaching my decision, I have considered the duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (WBFG Act). I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and consider that this decision is in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers well-being objectives, as required by section 8 of the WBFG Act.

Conclusion

16. I have found the proposal would be acceptable with regard to its effect on the CA. However, this is outweighed by the harm that would be caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling, as well as occupiers of the proposal, with regard to privacy.
17. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Claire MacFarlane

INSPECTOR