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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NP/08/441 | 5 dwellings  
Land adjacent to Blockett Farm, Little Haven  
Hearing  
The appeal is currently being held in abeyance. |
| NP/10/366 | Conversion and extension of existing dwelling  
Site at Penhyn, Newport, Pembs  
Hearing  
A Hearing was held on the 23rd August, 2011 and the Inspectors decision is awaited. |
| NP/10/425 | Retention of masonry walls & timber gates  
Summerhill Farmhouse & Cottages, Summerhill  
Householder  
The paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspectorate and his decision is awaited. |
| NP/10/399 | New Dwelling  
Land adjacent to Gilfach, 24 New Street, St Davids  
Written Representations  
The Statement of Case has been forwarded to the Inspectorate |
| NP/10/449 | Build wall tc front and side of property  
Shambella, 25 Castle View, Saundersfoot  
Written Representations  
The Statement of Case has been forwarded to the Inspectorate |
| NP/11/004 | Garden Building (retrospective)  
10 Seascape, Tenby  
Householder  
The appeal has been allowed and a copy of the decision notice is attached for your information. |
| NP/11/034 | Conversion to holiday accommodation  
Antil-U-Boat Station, Garnfawr, Strumble  
Written Representation  
The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP/11/035</td>
<td>Conversion to holiday accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antil-U-Boat Station, Garmfawr, Strumble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Written Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP/11/039</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant land at 44 Bryn Road, St Davids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Written Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>The paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC11/005</td>
<td>Construction of wooden clad chalet within curtilage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monk Haven Manor, St Ishmaels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector and a Public Inquiry has been arranged for 1st November 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5/7/11

by Hywel Wyn Jones BA (Hons) BTP
MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers
Date: 17/08/11

Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/A/11/2154444
Site address: 10 Seascape, Tenby, SA70 8JL

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- 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 Jason Cheal and Ms Liza May against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
- The application (ref: NP/11/004), dated 2 December 2010, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2011.
- The development is described as a 'retrospective application for garden building (resubmission)'.

Decision

1. For the reasons set out below I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for garden building at 10 Seascape, Tenby, SA70 8JL in accordance with the terms of the application, ref: NP/11/004, dated 2 December 2010, and the accompanying drawings, subject to the following condition:

   1. The building hereby approved shall be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwellinghouse only and shall not be used for any trade or commercial purposes.

Reasons

2. The appeal property lies within a mainly residential area characterised by closely-spaced modern, two-storey detached houses on steeply sloping land within the built-up area of the town. The main issue in this case is the effect of the building on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

3. The building has a simple design with a mono-pitched roof that follows the slope of the land. Its elevations are clad in horizontal timber boarding, with white uPVC framed openings on the front and one side elevation. The remaining elevations abut timber enclosures on the side and rear boundaries of the property.

4. As the building occupies the lowest of several tiers within the rear garden and is only marginally taller than the adjacent fences, its impact from outside the site is modest. Its timber cladding ensures that it sits unobtrusively next to the fencing. Whilst it differs in form and materials from the surrounding dwellings, this is consistent within its function as an ancillary building serving the dwelling.

http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk
5. I conclude that the scheme does not harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, it does not run counter to Policies 8, 15, 29 or 30 of the recently adopted Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan.

6. The Authority refers to the potential for the use of the building to cause disturbance to neighbours because of the absence of insulation within the structure. I have noted the expressions of support for the scheme from neighbours and find that there is no reason to believe that the ancillary use of the building would cause any unacceptable impact in this respect. However, to avoid the disturbance that could arise from a more intensive form of use I intend to impose a condition along the lines suggested by the Authority but, in the interests of precision, propose to amend the wording to limit the use to an ancillary residential use. The other suggested condition relates to undertaking the work in accordance with the submitted plans and its retention in that form thereafter. This condition is unnecessary given that the work has already been undertaken and that there is no justification to require that the building to be retained in strict accordance with its present state. No other planning conditions are reasonable or necessary.
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INSPECTOR