

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:-

<u>EC22/0088</u>	Unauthorised siting of polytunnel - Land at Llwyndrain Forest, Pentregalar, Crymych, Pembrokeshire, SA66 7SB
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.
<u>EC23/0124</u>	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
<u>EC24/0080</u>	Unauthorised change of use of land as a dog exercise area for hire - Millcombe, Cosheston, Pembroke Dock, Pembrokeshire, SA72 4TU
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
<u>EC23/0125</u>	Installation of residential pod in field adjoining driveway – Land east of Bryntirion Lodge, Cippyn, SA43 3LS
Type	Hearing
Current Position	The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW
<u>NP/25/0113/FUL</u>	Change of use of agricultural field attached to mixed usage so that we can run a secure dog exercise field business - Millcombe, Cosheston, Pembroke Dock, Pembrokeshire, SA72 4TU
Type	Written Reps
Current Position	The appeal has been allowed and a copy of the Inspectors decision is attached for your information.
<u>NP/25/0373/FUL</u>	Siting of a Shepherds Hut within the curtilage for holiday let accommodation including creation of car parking space for one vehicle - Melrose, Cresselly, Kilgetty, Pembrokeshire, SA68 0TX
Type	Written Reps
Current Position	The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW

NP/25/0698/TPO Removal of branch overhanging roof (TPO 98 G1) - Penybanc, 12, Catherine Street, St Davids, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6RJ

Type Written Reps

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

NP/25/0720/CLE Siting of caravan/ pod ancillary to lawful leisure use of parcel of land – Land east of Bryntirion Lodge, Cippyn, SA43 3LS

Type Hearing

Current Position The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW

NP/26/0036/FUL Small scale seasonal campsite - Land South of Parc Yr Eglwys, Dinas, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0SH

Type Written Reps

Current Position The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW

NP/25/0739/DOC Discharge Condition 5 (balcony enclosure) of NP/25/0302/FUL - Culverston, 16 Culver Park, Tenby, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7ED

Type Written Reps

Current Position The initial documentation has been forwarded to PEDW



Appeal Decision

by R H Duggan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 08.09.2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04931-V2P6Y6

Site address: Penybanc, 12 Catherine Street, St Davids SA62 6RJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent to undertake work to trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Anna Peck against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref: NP/25/0698/TPO, dated 26 November 2025, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2026.
 - The work proposed is to remove a branch overhanging roof.
 - The relevant Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is TPO 98 Pigsfoot Lane, St Davids which was confirmed on 20 March 2007.
 - A site visit was made on 26 August 2026.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant consent to remove a branch overhanging roof subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The works hereby permitted shall take place within 2 years of the date of the approval.

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

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the Council's decision to refuse consent to remove the branch is justified, having regard to the contribution that the tree makes to public amenity and the reasons put forward for the work.

Reasons

3. The amenity or aesthetic value of protected trees will generally depend on their form, size, height, prominence from public vantage points and setting. The pine tree subject to this appeal can be readily seen from the surrounding streets including Pit Street, Catherine Street and Pigsfoot Lane. The Pine Tree is seen as being part of a pair of trees in the locality, with the neighbouring tree being a Sycamore. It has developed with tall and slender stems and a high crown break, and the canopy is limited to roughly the top

third of the tree which harms its individual aesthetic value. There were signs of branches and larger limbs having previously fallen, there are dead branches on the lower stems and there were some signs of foliage decline, as seen by the National Park's officer.

4. Whilst the appeal tree makes a positive contribution to the group and the street scene, I conclude that it only makes a moderate contribution to the overall character and appearance of the street scene and St Davids Conservation Area. With any application for works to protected trees, a balancing exercise needs to be undertaken. The essential need for the works applied for must be weighed against the resultant loss to the amenity of the area, which in this case is of only moderate value.
5. It was clear on my site visit that the tree is a large specimen which towers over No 12 Catherine Street, and the branch in question clearly leans towards and overhangs the newly constructed extension, side walkway and outdoor patio area. The longer-term risk to people and property from tree or branch failure is not calculable with any degree of certainty, particularly when allowing for extreme weather events. The prevailing winds in this case are usually in a south westerly direction, which would blow debris away from the house. However, it is possible that winds in a storm would behave more erratically and the fall path of heavy material would be influenced by additional factors, including gravity and the weighting of the tree.
6. The introduction of domestic buildings in close proximity to trees and beneath canopies inevitably leads to a higher risk of harm to people and property from falling branches or tree failure than if the site remained undeveloped. In this case, the National Park Authority granted planning permission to extend the property (Reference: NP/24/0310/FUL) in the full knowledge of the tree, and the extension and renovation works have now been completed. The access walkway and outdoor amenity space and patio area, which I would expect to be frequently used by the occupants of the house, are directly below the canopy of the closest branch of the appeal tree. I acknowledge that the structure would be strong enough to withstand a branch falling on it, but in the event of this happening, ancillary damage to the fabric of the building is very possible. There would also be a real danger to the occupants of the house and given the height and proximity of the tree canopy above the house, I consider that such fear would be foreseeable, rational and reasonable. Therefore, I conclude that branch failure could occur, and there is a danger that debris and the nearest larger branch subject to this appeal has the potential to fall on the dwelling and occupants, as such there is sufficient justification for its removal.
7. I have taken account of all other matters raised by the National Park Authority, but do not find anything which materially alters my view as to the merits of the proposal, based on the main considerations as set out above. None of the other matters raised by the Authority are of sufficient weight, in my view, to alter the balance of considerations in this case, which I consider point towards the granting of consent to remove the overhanging branch.
8. 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



Appeal Decision

by R H Duggan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 08/09/2026

Appeal A reference: CAS-04791-R2N2H6

Site address: Millcombe, Cosheston, Pembroke Dock SA72 4TU

- 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 Ms Laura Howbrook against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/25/0113/FUL, dated 20 February 2025, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2025.
 - The development proposed is described as *“the change of use of agricultural field attached to a mixed usage so that we can run a secure dog exercise field business”*.
 - A site visit was made on 26 August 2026.
-

Appeal B reference: CAS-05016-D7H9T2

Site address: Land at Millcombe, Cosheston, Pembroke Dock SA72 4TU

- 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 appeal is made by Laura Howbrook and Sarah West against an enforcement notice issued by Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
- The enforcement notice, numbered EC24/0080, was issued on 18 March 2026.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is *‘Without the benefit of planning permission the material change of use of the land from agriculture to a mixed use of agricultural and the use of the land as a dog exercise area for hire’*.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 1. *Permanently cease the use of the site as a dog exercising area.*
 2. *Permanently remove from the land any paraphernalia associated with the use of the land as a dog exercise area including the moveable timber shelter, picnic table and chairs.*
- The period for compliance with the requirements are:

3 months beginning with the day this notice takes effect.

- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
 - A site visit was made on 26 August 2026.
-

Decisions

Appeal A – CAS-04791-R2N2H6

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the material change of use of the land from agriculture to a mixed use of agricultural and the use of the land as a dog exercise area for hire at Millcombe, Cosheston, Pembroke Dock SA72 4TU in accordance with the terms of the application, NP/25/0113/FUL, dated 20 February 2025, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Appeal B – CAS-05016-D7H9T2

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

Procedural Matters

3. There are two appeals at the appeal site and they both concern the material change of use of the land from agriculture to a mixed use of agricultural and the use of the land as a dog exercise area for hire. Appeal A is a planning appeal lodged under Section 78 of the Act and follows refusal of an application for planning permission for the development. Meanwhile, Appeal B relates to an appeal made under ground (g) against the enforcement notice (EN) which was issued by the National Park Authority in respect of the same development.
4. I have revised the description of development in my decision above in order to omit superfluous words. I am satisfied that the revisions are such that neither main party would be disadvantaged by doing so.
5. Section 180(1) of the Act provides that, where, after the service of an enforcement notice, planning permission is granted for any development carried out before the grant of that permission, the notice shall cease to have effect so far as inconsistent with that permission. This means that the planning permission granted by virtue of the success of Appeal A as set out in the reasons below overrides the EN to the extent that the planning permission authorises what is being enforced against.

Appeal A (Section 78 appeal)

Main Issue

6. Appeal A considers the planning merits of the scheme for which planning permission is sought, and the main issue is whether the location of the development is appropriate having regard to accessibility and sustainability.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a field in the countryside located approximately 850 metres northeast of Cosheston village. Access is along a C-class county road connecting Cosheston and Jenkins Point which has no dedicated footways. The National Park Authority (NPA) is concerned that the location of the field is in the open countryside away from the Rural Centre of Cosheston, and that there is no safe pedestrian route to the site from Cosheston and no public transport links, resulting in the site being in an

unsustainable location. The NPA goes on to state that there is no suitable pedestrian access from the nearby settlement of Cosheston and users of the field would need to travel by private motor vehicle to visit the site resulting in an increase in traffic and tailpipe emissions from private motor vehicles. Therefore, the NPA deems the scheme to be unacceptable under Policies 7 (Countryside), 29 (Sustainable Design), 54 (Community Facilities) and 59 (Sustainable Transport) of the Adopted Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (LDP).

8. Whilst I noted on my site visit that there are no pedestrian footways along the road, vehicle speeds were relatively low and it is not unfeasible that some users of the appeal site might access it on foot, and I saw that several people were walking their dogs along the road at that time. Nevertheless, I also acknowledge that due to the nature of a commercial dog walking facility, such users would also likely rely on the private car to drive to the facility as opposed to walking or using public transport. However, in a rural county such as Pembrokeshire it would be a difficult task to find a suitable location which would be both accessible by walking and public transport as well as being close to high levels of population and potential clients. In addition, the business is intended to provide a private space within which dogs can be exercised without potential hazard triggers, such as loud noises, speeding vehicles, emergency services sirens, which may be found when walking in urban areas.
9. The provision of a field to enable dogs to run safely off the lead requires a large open area, and there would likely to be very limited availability of such land in an urban area. The facility gives dog walkers a safe and secure environment in which to walk and exercise their dogs off the lead, and in my experience, there is a demand for such dog-walking facilities. I would also question the suitability of locating such a facility within an urban area close to residential properties given the potential for such facilities to give rise to noise disturbance at close quarters. Therefore, it is clear to me that a countryside location is required so that dogs can be exercised away from other stimuli and with sufficient space so that they can be safely let off the lead, if necessary. I would also question the appropriateness of using open spaces and sports fields within urban areas for dog walking, as these areas are regularly used by children and other members of the community for organised sports and recreation. The dual use of these sports fields for dog walking raises its own significant health and safety issues. As such, I consider the scheme complies with Policy 7 of the LDP which states that a rural enterprise or tourist attractions or recreational activity would be acceptable in principle where the need to locate in the countryside is essential.
10. People will always need to walk their dogs at least once a day and they will choose where to go on any given day. Due to the rural nature of the area, dog walkers will more often than not travel by car to access suitable dog walking spaces such as parks, local beaches and the Wales coastal path, and there is nothing to prevent people driving to rural and countryside locations to walk their dogs in more open areas in less restrictive locations. Given accessibility to sustainable transport options varies widely across the County and between urban and rural areas, it is reasonably likely that local dog-walkers in the area already regularly travel by private car to dog-walking destinations. Therefore, the appeal field would not necessarily be generating additional car borne trips but is providing an alternative location for dog owners that are already travelling to other areas in the County. In addition, although the use of the appeal site is likely to be more car dependant, given the size of the site it would inevitably operate at a relatively low intensity and only operate in daylight hours, such that operating hours would be less in the winter months.

11. Consequently, I consider the use of the appeal site is unlikely to generate a significant number of additional private vehicle movements that are not already operating on the local road network. I therefore consider that the environmental effects of private car travel arising from the appeal scheme to be limited and the site is an appropriate location with regard to accessibility and sustainability, and I find no conflict with LDP Policies 7, 29, 54 and 59 of the LDP.

Other matters

12. Concern has been raised by interested parties regarding the effect of the appeal scheme on the living conditions of nearby residents with regard to noise and disturbance. Noise is the primary concern with the level of disturbance from barking dogs and other associated noise and potential disturbance from the enhanced use of this site and also vehicles coming and going to and from the site. There was an initial concern from the PCC Public Protection team relating to the proximity of the proposed field to neighbouring dwellings on a site visit. However, upon further clarification it was found that it would be highly unlikely that noise should travel far enough to affect the third parties in question. I would agree with these conclusions.
13. I saw that there is limited paraphernalia associated with the dog exercise use within the site, other than a small wooden seated shelter close to the entrance. Views into the site are limited by virtue of a mature hedgerow and the retention of mature hedgerows helps retain the rural character of the wider area. Consequently, the development does not cause unacceptable harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside or wider landscape, nor would it have an unacceptably urbanising effect on this rural area. Therefore, my observations of the appeal site lead me to conclude that the development protects the special qualities of the National Park in compliance with Policy 8 (Special Qualities) of the LDP.

Conditions

14. A list of suggested conditions has been put forward by the NPA. I consider these conditions, as set out in the annex to this decision, to be necessary and would satisfy the tests in Circular 16/14: The Use of Planning Conditions in Development Management. I have adjusted the wording of some of the conditions in the interest of clarity and precision. Other than proposed condition (I), I consider 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 scheme, alongside securing enhancements as sought by national policy. The reasons for imposing each of the recommended conditions are summarised in the schedule of conditions.

Appeal A - Conclusion

15. Having regard to the above and considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
16. In reaching my conclusions, 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.

Appeal B - Ground (g)

17. Notwithstanding the outcome of Appeal A, I have still addressed the enforcement appeal. However, in practice, the outcome will be of little consequence, as planning permission has been granted for the development.

18. The ground (g) appeal is that the period for compliance with the notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. The appellant contends that the period for compliance is too short, and the submissions focus largely on the pending planning appeal and the perceived merits of the development. The appellant has not provided any substantive evidence to demonstrate why compliance with the EN could not reasonably be achieved within three months, and no other cogent reasons have been put forward.
19. I consider the compliance period of three months is sufficient to allow the appellant time to make any necessary arrangements for ceasing the unauthorised use and the removal of any associated structures.

Appeal B – Conclusion

20. For the reasons given, I conclude that the enforcement appeal under ground (g) should not succeed and I shall therefore uphold the enforcement notice.
21. Notwithstanding the outcome of the enforcement appeal, planning permission has been granted on Appeal A for the totality of the development alleged in the enforcement notice. In these circumstances, pursuant to s180(1) of the 1990 Act, the enforcement notice will cease to have effect.

Formal Decisions

Appeal A:

22. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the material change of use of the land from agriculture to a mixed use of agricultural and the use of the land as a dog exercise area for hire at Millcombe, Cosheston, Pembroke Dock SA72 4TU in accordance with the terms of the application, NP/25/0113/FUL, dated 20 February 2025, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Appeal B:

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

RH Duggan

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: Location plan; Planning statement; Proposed site plan and shelter details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application.

- 2) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, a scheme for biodiversity enhancement, including a timescale for its implementation, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity and to provide a net benefit to biodiversity in accordance with Policy 9 of Future Wales.

- 3) The use hereby permitted shall not operate or be open to customers outside the following times: 08:00hrs - 19:00hrs on Monday-Friday and 08:30hrs – 18:00hrs on Saturdays, Sundays & Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the living conditions of nearby residents in compliance with Local Development Plan Policy 30 (Amenity)

- 4) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, the off-street parking and turning facilities (for all vehicles, including cycles) shown on the site plan hereby approved shall be provided, and thereafter retained for that purpose for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway in compliance with Local Development Plan Policy 60 (Impacts of Traffic).

- 5) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, a waste management strategy should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect public health, the local amenity and the environment in compliance with Local Development Plan Policy 30 (Amenity).

- 6) No external lighting shall be installed or erected within the site without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of preserving visual amenity and the conservation status of protected species and the preservation and enjoyment of dark skies in Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, in compliance with Local Development Plan Policies 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), 8 (Special Qualities) and Policy 9 (Light Pollution) and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on Dark Skies.

- 7) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended for Wales) (or any order revoking and reenacting that Order with or without modification), no new structures, boundary treatments, or surfacing shall be erected/constructed/carried out on the site.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the site and its setting and the amenity and appearance of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park in compliance with Local Development Plan Policies 1 (National Park Purposes and Duty), 8 (Special Qualities) and 14 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park).



Appeal Decision

by R H Duggan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 08.09.2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04293-Q2W5H8

Site address: Land at Llwyndrain Forest, Pentregalar, Crymych 3A66 7SB

- 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 appeal is made by Mr Daniel Ralph Iddon against an enforcement notice issued by Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
- The enforcement notice, numbered EC22/0088 was issued on 29 April 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is:

Without planning permission,

- i. the erection of a round timber structure (identified as Structure 1 and cross-hatched in black on the attached plan and as photographed in Appendix 1),*
 - ii. the erection of timber decking (identified as Structure 2 and hatched black on the attached plan and as photographed in Appendix 1),*
 - iii. the erection of a timber structure used as a toilet washroom (identified as structure 3 and shaded orange on the attached plan and as photographed in Appendix 1), and*
 - iv. the erection of a raised timber platform and the siting of a Tipi (identified as structure 4 and hatched in blue on the attached plan and as photographed in Appendix 1).*
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - i. Take down and permanently remove from the Land the round timber structure (identified as structure 1 on the attached plan) and all materials arising and reinstate the Land to its former condition before the breach took place.*
 - ii. Permanently remove from the Land the timber decking (identified as structure 2 on the attached plan) and all materials arising and reinstate the land to its former condition before the breach took place.*
 - iii. Take down and permanently remove from the Land the timber structure (toilet/washroom) (identified as structure 3 on the attached plan) and the timber platform on which it sits and all materials arising and reinstate the Land to its former condition before the breach took place.*

- iv. *Take down and permanently remove the timber constructed raised platform and Tipi (identified as structure 4 on the attached plan) and all materials arising and reinstate the Land to its former condition before the breach took place.*
 - The period for compliance with the requirements are:
 - Three months beginning with the day on which this Notice takes effect.*
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) a) and g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
 - A site visit was made on 26 August 2026.
-

Decision

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

Background and Main Issue

2. Two prior notification applications were approved by the National Park Authority (NPA) in 2020 on an area of land to the west of the appeal site. One application was for a forestry building required for HSE compliance welfare facilities for forest workers and to provide processing timber facilities, storage and workshop and provide Forest School facilities (Reference: NP/20/0164/PNF), and the second for forestry tracks (Reference: NP/20/0165/PNF). It was later established by the NPA that the forestry building was built in the incorrect location and two large polytunnels had also been erected. A retrospective planning application (Reference: NP/25/0254/FUL) has been submitted by the appellant for the forestry barn, forestry tracks and hardstanding, and the development subject to this Enforcement Notice (EN) namely a welfare hut and roundhouse. As these form part of a separate retrospective planning application, they do not fall to be determined by me within this appeal.
3. An appeal under Section 174(2)(a) of the Act (the ground (a) appeal) is that planning permission should be granted for the breach of planning control as alleged in the EN. I shall determine the appeal accordingly, having particular regard to the following main issue: *the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area having particular regard to the special qualities of the National Park.*

The ground (a) appeal and deemed planning application

4. The appeal site is located within forestry woodland to the southeast of the Preseli Hills approximately 4km to the southwest of Crymych. For the purposes of planning policy, the site falls within the open countryside where local and national policies seek to strictly control development. The appeal site is also located within a sensitive woodland partially surrounded by a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (Gweunydd Blaencleddau) and the Gweunydd Blaencleddau Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The site is also within a historic landscape (HLW)(D)7 (Preseli).
5. During my visit I saw that the appeal site was effectively a clearing within the woodland and contained various timber structures that consist of a timber platform which supports a tipi which is being used by the appellant when visiting the site from his home in England. A timber shed has also been erected on the platform which is used as a toilet and washroom. Timber steps lead down from the raised platform to another decked timber area and a circular timber building which is being used as sleeping accommodation.

6. I note that the appellant's Llwyndrain Forest's strategic woodland management plan states that approximately 10ha of timber needs to be clear-felled in the next fifteen years, consequently tree harvesting, primary processing of timber, the composting of timber wastes and tree nursery activities to restock the woodland take place within the forestry. The appellant has explained that the welfare facilities are required to provide a safe, comfortable rest space for workers, simple toilet and wash up facilities, somewhere to prepare and eat food and somewhere to sleep when staying overnight. The appellant states that these are best located some distance from the milling area within a screened, forested area where they could be accessed readily by workers from different parts of the site, but where they would be sheltered from wind and rain and closer to the main access to the forest.
7. Be that as it may, I would agree with the NPA that the scale, permanence and design of the structures exceed what would reasonably be required to provide temporary worker welfare accommodation. The size and domestic appearance of the timber structures, as well as the level of facilities provided, suggest that they are being used for more permanent residential occupancy and overnight accommodation in addition to any incidental welfare facilities that may be necessary to comply with HSE requirements for workers within the forest.
8. Although I saw that the site is partially screened by vegetation, the development creates a cluster of timber structures with a residential and domestic appearance within the forestry. Contrary to the appellant's view, these are seen as alien features when viewed within this sensitive woodland setting and have a harmful impact on this historic landscape.
9. Whilst I have noted the appellant's siting preference for the buildings, the location of the appeal site is a significant distance from the main operational area of the forestry activity. The dispersed siting of the accommodation, toilet/washing facilities and other timber decking structures away from the forestry barn and polytunnels increase the overall impact of the development on the landscape. If there is a functional and operational need for welfare facilities one would normally expect these to be contained within or immediately adjacent to the main forestry building and associated tracks/hardstanding. Indeed, paragraph A14 of Technical Advice Note 6 'Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities' states: *The siting of a new agricultural or forestry building, road, excavation or waste deposit, or fish tank can have a considerable impact on the surrounding landscape...New buildings should normally form part of a group rather than stand in isolation, and relate to existing buildings in size and colour.*
10. Overall, I consider that the erection of the timber buildings and structures found on the site and which are subject to the EN, have a significantly harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and on this valued historic landscape. My observations of the appeal site lead me to conclude that the development is obtrusive within this landscape and is detrimental to the special qualities of the National Park. To this end, the development conflicts with Policies 1, 7, 8, 14, 29 and 30 of the Adopted Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 (LDP) 2020.

Other Matters

11. As the welfare structures, including the toilet/washroom, are sited adjacent to a watercourse Natural Resources Wales was consulted at the appeal stage. NRW confirmed that the site is within a river catchment for the Milford Haven Inner water body of the Pembrokeshire Marine SAC, and that the development is also shown to be within the catchment of the River Cleddau SAC.

12. The nature of the proposed development has the potential to increase phosphate levels, and a likely significant effect on the integrity of the SAC cannot be ruled out. In these circumstances, the decision maker as the competent authority is required to carry out an Appropriate Assessment, and in determining this appeal I fall to be the competent authority.
13. In this case, as I have found the development unacceptable for its impact on the character and appearance of the area and on the special qualities of the National Park it has not been necessary for me to undertake an Appropriate Assessment. Even if the development was acceptable in terms of its effect on the SAC this would not outweigh my conclusions on other grounds.

Conclusions on the ground (a) appeal

14. I have taken into account all the matters raised by the appellant in support of the appeal but having regard to the main issue that I have identified above and the evidence before me, I conclude for the reasons set out above the ground (a) appeal and the deemed application should not succeed.

Ground g)

15. This ground of appeal is that the period for compliance with the notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. In this case, the enforcement notice requires compliance within two calendar months.
16. The appellant states that if this appeal fails it will be necessary for the appellant to make a further prior notification application to erect similar facilities in a different location of the site. He will also need to secure a contractor to take down the facilities currently erected and either rebuild them or reuse the materials used for them to construct another building to fulfil the welfare functions required. The three months stipulated in the EN is not sufficient time to ensure that this can happen without unnecessary disruption to the forestry activities when suitable welfare provision may not be in place. Therefore, the appellant considers that six months would be sufficient time for him to make the necessary arrangements and find a contractor to carry out the work.
17. I am mindful that the need for an extension of the period for compliance needs to be balanced against the harm set out in the EN, which in this case is the harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the special qualities of the National Park and the resulting conflict with the Development Plan. Extending the period of compliance to 6 months, as suggested by the appellant, would prolong the identified harm without necessary justification or mitigation. I am not persuaded by the appellant's arguments that a longer compliance period is required.
18. The harms identified in the EN represent the public interest which I must weigh against the arguments put forward by the appellant. The appeal on ground (g) must, therefore, fail.

Conclusions

19. I have taken into account all matters raised by the appellant, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that have led me to my conclusions that the appeal should be dismissed, and the enforcement notice should be upheld. I refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.

20. In reaching my conclusions, 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.

RH Duggan

INSPECTOR