

## REPORT OF HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT ON APPEALS

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

**NP/08/434**                      Enlargement of existing hay barn, erection of cattle shed, yard and pigsties and formation of hedgebanks and provision of slurry tanks - Llethyr, Cwm Gwaun  
**Type**                              Hearing  
**Current Position**              The appeal has been dismissed and the Inspectors decision is attached for your information.

This decision emphasises the importance of applications being submitted with accurate, precise, scaled plans which represent fully the development being applied for. It also clearly states that the onus for providing accurate drawings falls on the applicant and agent and it is not for the Local Planning Authority to attempt to understand the content of an application where plans and information are lacking in detail or accuracy, nor for it to provide those drawings for the applicant. Where plans are lacking, this appeal decision clearly shows that it is appropriate for the Authority to refuse the application.

**NP/11/497**                      Outline application for erection of 3-bedroomed house with approval sought for access and layout - Land Adjacent to 7 Walton Hill, Little Haven, Haverfordwest.  
**Type**                              Hearing  
**Current Position**              The appeal has been dismissed and the Inspectors decision is attached for your information.

**NP/12/0209**                      Agricultural workshop/store associated with the Long Barn units & smallholding(retrospective) – Garden/Paddock area of The Long Barns, Lochvane  
**Type**                              Written Representations  
**Current Position**              The appeal has been dismissed and the Inspectors decision is attached for your information.

**NP/12/0230**                      Low Impact Development on 6 hectares to include dwelling, an agricultural barn, an education room, a polytunnel and volunteer sleeping space  
**Type**                              Hearing  
**Current Position**              A Hearing has been arranged and will take place on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2013.

**NP/12/0319**                      Detached dwelling - Land adjacent to Yr Efail, Pontiago  
**Type**                              Hearing  
**Current Position**              The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector and a Hearing has been arranged for 9<sup>th</sup> April 2013.

**NP/12/0409**                      Change of use from shop to residential flat – Webb Computers, 17 Warren Street, Tenby  
**Type**                              Written Representations  
**Current Position**              The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector.

**NP/12/0386** Certificate of Lawfulness for siting of static caravan & metal container and all uses in excess of 20 years up to the present day, taking place on the holding – Erw-Lon, Lydstep

**Type** Inquiry

**Current Position** The initial paperwork has been forwarded to the Inspector.

## **Other Matters**

### **Bettws Newydd, Newport**

#### **Purpose of Report**

To advise members of a deviation from the agreed landscaping scheme in relation to Bettws Newydd, Newport, required to be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme under condition 2 of planning permission NP/10/033 and to seek members endorsement to taking no further action with regard to this deviation. This matter has been brought to members at the discretion of the Head of Development Management in view of the complex history of the site.

#### **Introduction/Background**

Planning permission was granted on appeal for the retention and completion of a dwelling at Bettws Newydd, Newport and to quash the enforcement notice in respect of the same on the 10<sup>th</sup> December 2010. In allowing the appeal, conditions were imposed on the permission, with condition 2 requiring the implementation of the approved landscaping scheme to be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or completion of the dwelling, whichever was the sooner. Condition 3 required a Landscape Management Plan for the approved landscaping scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Authority within 3 months of the permission and for the Management Plan to be implemented thereafter in accordance with the approved schedule.

The Landscape Management Plan was submitted to the Authority on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2011 and was approved on the 9<sup>th</sup> March 2011. Works to implement the approved landscaping were subsequently carried out and the site was inspected on the 7<sup>th</sup> August 2012 when spot checks of the earth banking/bunding were carried out with regard to their respective heights and compliance with the approved plans.

It was evident from that visit that there were some deviations within the heights of the bunding on the eastern side of the site. The applicant's landscape architect was subsequently informed and following his own survey being carried out it was agreed that there were some deviations in the height of the eastern bund with the height being lower than approved within a range along the bund of 225mm to 750mm. Planting has been carried out on and around the bunding in accordance with the approved scheme with a significant amount of woodland mix planting, hedgerow planting and standard trees including maple, birch, and wild cherry. With the exception of the height of the bunding, the scheme has been carried out in accordance with the approved landscaping scheme. Your



---

## Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Gwrandawriad a gynhaliwyd ar 8/11/12  
Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 8/11/12

gan **G P Thomas BA(Hons) DMS  
MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: **07/12/12**

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 8/11/12  
Site visit made on 8/11/12

by **G P Thomas BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: **07/12/12**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/A/12/2178308**

**Site address: Llethr, Cwm Gwaun, Pembrokeshire SA65 9SB**

**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 D James against the decision of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref 08/434, dated 26 August 2008, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2011.
  - The development proposed is: *Demolition of pigsties enlargement of hay barn, cattle shed & yard pigsties. Formation of hedge bank & slurry tanks.*
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. In the decision notice the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority [NPA] described the proposal as "Enlargement of existing hay barn, erection of cattle shed, yard and pigsties and formation of hedgebanks and provision of slurry tanks." It was agreed at the hearing that this description was more accurate than that given in the planning application which I have included as part of the heading above. At the hearing the appellant indicated that he would not be proceeding with the slurry tanks and withdrew that element of the proposal. He also indicated the intention to provide 5 pig sties rather than the 8 indicated on the plans that accompanied the planning application.
3. These changes were accepted by the NPA and it is on that basis that I have determined this appeal.

### Main Issues

4. Whether sufficient information is available to assess the proposal; the effect the proposal would have on the surrounding countryside, having regard to its location within the National Park; and, whether it is appropriate to require a S106 agreement to identify and define storage areas and prevent the severance of the land and buildings.

## Reasons

### Background

5. The appeal relates to farm buildings to serve some 24 acres of surrounding land owned by the appellant. I understand that other land is also rented in the vicinity. The farm holding is a roughly rectangular area of open land on the upper slopes of the valley. The land slopes gently downwards from the north to the densely wooded edge along the lower valley side. The nearby farmhouse is not within the appellant's control.
6. Planning permission was granted in 2003 for the erection of an agricultural building at the site (NP/03/301). That building, described as the hay barn, is in place.
7. Following the submission of the planning application in September 2008, extended discussions took place between the appellant and the NPA. A site visit in 2010 found that development had commenced but was not in accordance with the submitted plans. The deviations from the submitted plans were drawn to the attention of the appellant and his agent in 2010 and extensive correspondence followed seeking to resolve these matters. In July 2011 NPA officers required various details to be submitted within a specified timescale and indicated that failure to submit the information by 3 October 2011 would be likely to result in a recommendation to refuse the application.
8. The application was reported to the Development Management Committee on 19 October 2011. The principle of development was considered to be acceptable in design terms and with regard to the impact on the National Park landscape and amenities, subject to a Section 106 agreement tying the land to the buildings and requiring the outside storage areas to be identified. However, the development that had taken place was considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the area and was unacceptable. The Committee accepted the recommendation and resolved that unless specified information was submitted within two months, the planning application be refused. The required material was not forthcoming and the application was subsequently refused.

### *Available information*

9. Having measured the submitted plans and compared the footprint plan with the submitted elevation drawings during the hearing it was agreed that the scale of 1:50 given for drawing 'PLAN OF HAYSHED' was incorrect and should be 1:100. I consider this error could be easily rectified and does not justify refusing the proposal. However, the NPA indicated that the dimensions of the buildings that had been built did not accord with the measurements given on the submitted plans. The extended hay barn is larger than the dimensions given on the submitted plans, whilst the cattle shed is smaller than the submitted plans. This was not challenged by the appellant.
10. At the site visit I saw that the extensions to the north and south of the original hay barn were in place. However, the pitches of the roof of the existing barn and the proposed extensions did not correspond with the submitted plans. The appellant considered that the plans of the proposed northwest elevation and cross section B-B were incorrectly drawn and accepted that they did not show the structure as built.
11. The appellant acknowledged that the pigsties had not been built in accordance with the original submitted plans 'NEW PIG STIES' which indicated the use of curved corrugated cement sheets, and outdoor pens for each sty. The sties that had been

built had monopitched roofs; had no outdoor pens and a mixture of materials had been used in their construction. I accept that it is intended to attach more sties in the future and that the eastern side wall is effectively a temporary structure. There is a substantial difference between what has been built and the scheme that was submitted as part of the planning application.

12. The appellant had produced amended plans of the proposed pig sties, but these had not been accepted by the NPA for reasons which are not necessary for me to elaborate upon. However, even if these plans had been accepted and were before me, the sties that have been built are substantially different to the amended scheme.
13. There is no open yard to the east of the cattle shed but I accept that this is 'work in progress' and the scheme could be completed in accordance with the submitted plans in the future.
14. The submitted drawings show a proposed hedge bank to the north and east of the building with two breaks providing field accesses. During my visit I saw that the bank extends in a roughly straight line across the contour of the land and well beyond the 'red line area' of the planning application. Furthermore, the bank is significantly higher than that shown in cross section on the submitted plans and there is a single field access in a different position to that shown on the plans.
15. There are significant differences between the submitted plans and the development that has taken place. I accept that some of the disparities between the submitted plans and the development that has taken place (e.g. the cattle shed) are relatively minor and do not justify refusing the proposal. However, the disparity in other elements including the hay barn extensions, the pigsties and hedge bank are so significant that it would not be appropriate to rely on the submitted drawings as a basis for granting planning permission for the development that has taken place.
16. The appellant argues that the plans are sufficient to allow the NPA to understand the proposal. However, an application for full planning permission should ensure that the plans provide sufficient clarity to indicate what any ensuing planning permission relates to. I conclude that there is such a disparity between what has been built and the submitted plans that it would be perverse to allow the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans since they do not reflect the actual situation.
17. The approach taken by the NPA has also been criticised. However, it is evident that the authority spent an extensive period trying to resolve the situation by seeking amended drawings to properly reflect the reality of the situation. Whilst illness played a part in extending the timescale of the discussions, the failure to provide accurate drawings falls entirely on the appellant and his agent. I note that even the most recent drawings that were prepared are not an accurate representation of the development that has taken place.

*Impact on surrounding countryside*

18. The farm complex is visible along the hillside in middle and longer distance views across the valley, and the western end of the hay barn is visible from the former farm house nearby. The hay barn and cattle shed are built of modern materials that are commonly used in such agricultural buildings and I do not consider the form, scale and design as shown on the submitted plans would be harmful to the visual qualities of the surrounding rural landscape. This is confirmed by the development that has taken place.

19. Whilst I consider the design, scale and materials of the proposed pigsties indicated on the submitted plan are acceptable, I consider the structure that has been built is out of keeping with the visual qualities of the surrounding area due to its higher profile and the use of inappropriate materials. I acknowledge that the sties are largely hidden from view but that of itself, does not justify the construction of a utilitarian structure that causes significant visual harm. I also find the banking to be a visually harsh and unyielding element in the landscape. I conclude that these elements of the scheme as built cause unacceptable harm to the rural landscape.

*Storage areas*

20. Since the farm unit is readily seen from surrounding areas, I accept there is a need to ensure that farm machinery and implements are stored in a suitable area to minimise their visual impact on the surrounding countryside. However, I am not convinced that this matter requires a Section 106 agreement. The submission of a planning application showing the proposed area could adequately be controlled by a suitable planning condition.

*Land Severance*

21. I accept that further fragmentation of the landholding associated with the farm buildings would bring into question the need for the extent of the buildings that are the subject of the planning application (and those that are in place). However, given the impact such fragmentation would have on the viability of the enterprise as a whole, there is no evidence before me to indicate that this is likely in the future. Furthermore, I consider such matters relate to land management and are not directly relevant to planning. I conclude that it is unreasonable to require an undertaking relating to the severance of the land and buildings.

**Other Matters**

22. The appellant and supporters at the hearing raised concerns that regard had not been given to Technical Advice Note (Wales) 20: THE WELSH LANGUAGE - UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND PLANNING CONTROL [TAN 20]. TAN 20 recognises that the needs and interests of the Welsh language may be a material consideration in determining planning applications. I accept that a large percentage of the residents of the area are Welsh speaking, but this appeal relates to the adequacy of the submitted plans and the linguistic background of the appellant has no relevance to the appeal. At the hearing the appellant's representative indicated that his concerns relating to TAN 20 were more general in nature and produced no evidence to show its relevance to this appeal. I conclude that the relevant issues in this appeal do not relate to the needs and interests of the Welsh language and TAN 20 carries no weight in my determination.

23. I have had regard to all other matters raised, including the representations made in support of the appellant, but find nothing to sway me from my overall conclusion to dismiss the appeal.

*Gwynedd P Thomas*

Inspector

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr J Rheinallt Evans ARIBA            Agent  
FCI Arb

Mr D James                                Appellant

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms V Hirst MA MRTPI                    Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority

Mr P Davies BSc (Hons) MRICS        Carmarthenshire County Council (Agricultural  
Advisor)

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr J Phillips                                Cwm Gwaun Community Council - Supporting  
the appellant

Mr A Davies                                 Supporting the appellant

### **Documents submitted at the hearing**

- 1 Letter from ArchiSurv Ltd
- 2 Letter dated 8 November 2011 to Mr J R Evans from Ms Hirst
- 3 Letter from Councillor Bob Kilmister



## Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Gwrandawriad a gynhaliwyd ar 15/11/12  
Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 15/11/12

gan **A D Poulter BA BArch RIBA**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 28/12/12

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 15/11/12  
Site visit made on 15/11/12

by **A D Poulter BA BArch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 28/12/12

**Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/A/12/2180572**

**Site address: Land adjacent to 7 Walton Hill, Little Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3LA.**

**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 outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by the executors of Mr R Llewellyn against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
- The application Ref NP/11/497, dated 8 August 2011, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2012.
- The development proposed is: *the siting of detached dwellinghouse.*

### Procedural Matters

1. The application was made in outline, with matters relating to appearance, landscaping and scale reserved for later consideration. The necessary details of the approximate height, width and length of the proposed building are provided on indicative drawings, which show the proposed location of buildings, routes and open spaces, and also the general orientation and levels of the proposed house.

### Decision

2. I dismiss the appeal.

### Main Issues

3. These are: the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, paying special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the adjacent Little Haven Conservation Area; the effect on neighbours' living conditions; and whether appropriate provision would be made to assist with the delivery of affordable housing.

### Reasons

4. The appeal relates to an elevated sloping site overlooking Little Haven. Access would be from an existing access track serving some other dwellings. The site was formerly a garden area and has been terraced. The proposed house would be laid out across the contours of the land, on three different levels.



### Character and Appearance

5. The Authority's supplementary planning guidance entitled *Little Haven Conservation Area Proposals* was subject to extensive public consultation, and has been formally adopted. It is therefore a consideration of substantial weight in this appeal. At paragraph 2.3, the physical context, approaches and vistas of the conservation area are described as including some properties built sporadically on valley slopes, jostling for sea views. I consider that is an apt description of many of the properties in the vicinity of the appeal site. The proposed development would also be oriented primarily to take advantage of the sea views. To achieve this, it would be built across the contours. In construction terms this would be more difficult than building along the contours, and is therefore a generally less common form of development. In the context of the appeal site, however, I do not consider that the proposed layout and orientation would appear incongruous or out of place. The height, width and length of the proposed building would also be in keeping with others in the vicinity, and so would also be visually acceptable. To the extent that details are provided at this stage, I conclude that proposed development would be in keeping with the landscape character of Little Haven, and would not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the area, or the setting of the conservation area.
6. I conclude that in principle, the proposed development would not be contrary to policies to protect and enhance the special qualities and character of the National Park, including Policies 8(b), 15(b) and 15(d) of the *Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan* (LDP)(September 2010).

### Living Conditions

7. The proposed building would be well over 20m from the neighbouring houses known as 'Mount Pleasant' and 'Pendyffryn'. Its orientation, and that of other houses in the vicinity, would be such that the windows of habitable rooms would not directly face each other. The proposed house would overlook otherwise relatively private garden areas at a close distance, but the loss of privacy that would occur could be minimised by appropriate boundary treatments and detailed design. The level of mutual privacy would then be not less than may be reasonably expected in a settled area. Similarly, the privacy of other dwellings in the vicinity could be adequately protected by the normal reserved matters conditions. Although the proposed house would be on higher ground than other properties it would not be so close, tall or bulky that it would appear unpleasantly or unacceptably overbearing.
8. Subject to the detailed design of the proposed building and landscaping, which are reserved matters, I therefore do not consider that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on neighbours' living conditions. I therefore do not consider that it would be contrary to policies to protect residential amenity, including LDP Policy 30.

### Affordable Housing

9. LDP Policy 45 relates to affordable housing. In accordance with this Policy the Authority will seek a commuted sum to help with the delivery of affordable housing on proposals for individual units, such as the appeal scheme. This Policy is supported by supplementary planning guidance (SPG) entitled *Affordable Housing*, which again has been subject to consultation and has been adopted, and is therefore also a consideration of substantial weight. In accordance with the guidance the financial contribution required on single dwelling applications is expressed as a contribution per

square metre, on a scale that will rise as part of the phased introduction of LDP Policy 45. Viability is a consideration that will be taken into account. Detailed guidance on the information required for developer viability appraisals is set out at section 17 of the SPG. In the first instance the spending of contributions would be restricted to the local Community Council area and land within adjacent Community Councils which lies within the National Park. If the money is not spent within 3 years it would be made available to spend on the delivery of affordable housing within these Community Council areas, but outside the National Park. If it is not spent within 5 years it would be returned. Developers are required to enter into a legal agreement with the Authority.

10. I recognise the appellant's concerns that provisions have been made in the development plan that are likely to meet the need for affordable housing in the local area for the foreseeable future. They therefore question the need for the contribution. However, in accordance with the SPG, if a contribution cannot be applied locally within a reasonable period it would be returned.
11. A commuted sum properly calculated in accordance with the SPG would be necessary, relevant to planning, directly related to the proposed development, would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and reasonable in all other respects. It would therefore meet the tests of the Community Infrastructure Levy regulations, and those set out in Welsh Office Circular 13/97: *Planning Obligations* and paragraph 3.7.2 of PPW (Edition 5, November 2012). The policy requirement to make a contribution towards affordable housing is therefore an important material consideration in this appeal.
12. The appellant has submitted an affordable housing statement based on local sales values, build costs, and land values based on examples of sales. It aims to demonstrate on this basis that there would be little profit after paying a commuted sum towards affordable housing. However, this is not the approach to viability appraisals set out in section 17 of the SPG, which does not take land values into account as an input into the appraisal. Rather, the SPG approach would generate a residual land value, representing the maximum a developer can pay for the land and still make a reasonable level of profit.
13. In my view the appellant's approach to viability appraisal is flawed, as it takes an expectation of land value into account, rather than the amount that it would be worth whilst still making a reasonable profit. I therefore do not consider that it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be viable if the normal rate of contribution to affordable housing is paid.
14. The SPG approach takes account of exceptional costs attached to development, including those associated with abnormal sewerage works and foundations. In view of the constraints of the appeal site it may be that such costs might be incurred in the proposed development. However, they have not been identified or quantified. Although the appellant indicated a willingness to accept a lower rate of commuted payment at the hearing it is not for me to negotiate a lower rate, and in any event I have no sound basis on which to assess one. I have no legal agreement before me, and no basis on which to formulate a condition that would meet the tests set out in Welsh Office Circular 35/95: *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*.
15. I consider for the above reasons that the proposed development would not make appropriate provision to assist with the delivery of affordable housing. The proposal would conflict in this respect with LDP Policy 45 and the associated SPG.

### *Summary of Conclusions*

16. I have concluded above that the proposed development would not conflict with policies to protect the special qualities and character of the National Park, or local resident's living conditions. However, it would conflict with policies to provide affordable housing. I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole. I have taken into account that the proposed development would be of benefit in producing an additional unit of energy efficient, attractive market housing within a designated settlement, close to services. It would also be of some benefit to economic development and would generate some employment opportunities. It would be sustainable in these respects. However, these benefits could be expected to arise from a development making an appropriate contribution to affordable housing. They therefore do not outweigh the conflict with planning policy that I have identified.
17. The capacity of, and ability to connect to the foul drainage system drainage would be a matter to be overcome at the detailed design stage. The possibility that a connection may have to run through third-party land may give rise to legal difficulties, but this is not a matter for the planning system. In the past, applications relating to the appeal site have been refused because of reasons relating to the erosion of open land. However, as the site is now within the settlement boundary there would now be no erosion of open land within the countryside and, in principle, the residential development of the site would be acceptable subject to the normal planning considerations. Local residents concerns with regard to these matters have therefore not influenced my decision.
18. Nevertheless, having taken into account all other matters that have been raised, I find nothing that would indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*A D Poulter*

**INSPECTOR**

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr R Banks	Agent, Owen Banks Planning and Development
Ms M Whitewright	
Ms Marion Llewellyn	

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms J Evans	Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
------------	---

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr A Vaughan -Harries	Agent, Hayston Developments & Planning Limited, representing Mr & Mrs May
Mrs R May	Local resident
Mr P Phillips	Local resident
Mrs G Parker	Local resident



---

## Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 27/11/12

gan Siân Worden BA DipTP MCD  
MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 19/12/12

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27/11/12

by Siân Worden BA DipTP MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 19/12/12

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/A/12/2182713**

**Garden/paddock of The Long Barns, Lochvane, Pen-y-Cwm, Haverfordwest,  
Pembrokeshire SA62 6BA**

**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 Mrs Joanne Proops against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref NP/12/0209, dated 12 April 2012, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2012.
  - The development proposed is an agricultural workshop/store associated with the Long Barn holiday units and small holding (in retrospect).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The new store was in place at the time of my site visit and the application was retrospective.

### Main Issues

3. I consider that the main issues in this case are:
  - whether the proposed building is essential and thus justified in this location, and
  - its effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside.

### Reasons

#### *Essential in this location?*

4. The appeal site is a package of land in the countryside which contains a pair of holiday cottages converted from a barn and an existing workshop. The development which is the subject of this appeal is an additional store which has a single storey, a pair of double doors to the front and a separate cupboard for chemicals partitioned off in one corner.
  5. The grounds around the buildings slope down to a stream and are mainly kept in a natural state. They include paths, areas of lawn and mown grass, shrubs and a more formal garden, recently planted young trees and parking surfaces, all of which require
-

frequent maintenance and equipment with which to carry this out effectively. The cottages themselves also need looking after, one of the most important tasks being the laundry. I understand that holiday guests expect comfort and cleanliness and how important it is, therefore, to launder linen and towels frequently and to a high standard. Having visited the site on a wet, winter's day I also appreciate how difficult it can be to get high volumes of washing dry.

6. The existing workshop, which was permitted in 2001, is a large building with two roller shutter doors taking up most of the frontage. It has a toilet and shower, sink, washing machines and internal washing line. A galleried mezzanine floor covers part of its area and, overall, it has a generous amount of floorspace. Indeed, it seems to me that it might be possible to reorganise or even to sub-divide the building in order to keep the machines and their fumes, and chemicals, separate from other uses. In any event I do not consider that any conflict between the various activities accommodated in the existing workshop is sufficient justification for the additional store. Neither is the holiday cottage business, including the grounds, of such a size as to explain why two, quite generously sized, buildings are necessary to service it. I note that the appellant wishes to also park or store her car in the workshop but, in this case, I do not consider that to be essential.
7. The appeal site is outside of a centre identified in the Local Development Plan; in such locations development is only permitted if it meets one of several criteria, none of which is applicable to the development here. Although the land is referred to as a holding its use is not agricultural and the new building cannot be justified on that ground. Furthermore I have found that, whilst the new store might make for more convenient management of the enterprise, it is not strictly necessary in order to support the tourism activity and thus not essential in this location. The development is therefore contrary to Policy 7 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (LDP) which was adopted in 2010.

#### *Character and appearance of the countryside*

8. The new store is located away from the holiday cottages and existing workshop but is similar in scale to these; its materials and form are typical of modern rural buildings. It is well-screened by trees and blends into the landscape such that it is not clearly visible from many viewpoints. All in all it does not fail to harmonise with the landform and landscape character of the National Park and is not of a scale incompatible with its surroundings. On this issue, therefore, it complies with LDP Policies 15 and 30 and does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside.

#### *Other matters*

9. I drove past Llanungar-Fawr Farm during my visit and saw that it is in an exposed and more visible location above Solva. I have little information, however, with regard to other aspects of that case and cannot draw any helpful comparisons with it. I also saw the trailer used for storing wood; it is a small container tucked away at the edge of the trees which has little impact on the appearance of the area. Its removal would not therefore be a significant benefit and does not weigh heavily in favour of the new store. I have taken all the matters raised, including support for the development, into consideration but not found any which would outweigh the harm.

#### **Conclusion**

10. The new store is not detrimental to the character and appearance of the countryside. On the other hand it is not essential to the use it supports, nor does it fulfil any of the

policy criteria whereby development will be permitted, and thus is not justified in this location. That is sufficient reason in itself to refuse the development.

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Siân Worden*

Inspector