REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM LEADER ON APPEALS

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

NP/18/0665/FUL	Dan y Garn, Treleddyd Fawr, St Davids
Type	Written Representations
Current Position	The appeal has been dismissed & a copy of the Inspectors report is attached for your information.

NP/18/0548/FUL	Temple Bar, Amroth
Type	Written Representations
Current Position	The initial paperwork has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate

NP/19/0065/FUL	The Woodland Farm, The Rhos
Type	Hearing
Current Position	The initial paperwork has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate

EC/18/0034	Material change of use of land to Booking Office & overnight camping – Abereiddy Beach, Abereiddy
Type	Inquiry
Current Position	The initial paperwork has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate

EC/16/0124	Unauthorised caravans on site – Hendre, Newport
Type	Written Representations
Current Position	The initial paperwork has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

The Planning Inspectorate
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 22/05/19

gan Janine Townsley LLB(Hons) Cyfreithiwr (Nad yw'n ymarfer)

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 25.06.2019

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22/05/19

by Janine Townsley LLB(Hons) Solicitor (Non-practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 25.06.2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/A/19/3224885

Site address: Dan y Garn, Treleddyd Fawr, Treleddyd Fawr Road, Rhodiad, St. Davids, SA62 6PP.

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 & Mrs Anthony & Margaret Meixner against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
- The application Ref NP/18/0665/FUL, dated 8 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2019.
- The development proposed is change of use of Dan y Garn from unrestricted holiday accommodation to unencumbered residential use.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are whether the proposed development complies with local and national policy related to development in the countryside and whether the proposal complies with local policy related to financial contributions in lieu of affordable housing provision.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises holiday accommodation which is located together with a number of similar properties to make up the Treleddyd Fawr complex. The appeal site falls outside of any settlement boundary and is therefore located within the countryside for development plan purposes. The wider area is characterised by the countryside setting and the site is surrounded by open fields with only sporadic development in the wider area.

4. The appeal property was granted planning permission for holiday accommodation in 1989[1] (the 1989 permission), subject to the following condition: *The holiday unit(s) hereby approved shall not be used for human habitation during the period 10th*

[1] NP/212/89

January to 28th February in any year. The appeal proposal is for the use of the site to be changed so that it can be occupied all year around as a permanent residence.

5. Policy 7 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (to 2021) (LDP) states that outside the identified centres, development will only be permitted in certain circumstances including housing for essential farming or forestry. Criterion (d) of the policy relates to the conversion of appropriate buildings to a range of uses with affordable housing being given priority in residential conversions.

6. The appellant has not specified which of the exceptions set out in policy 7 the appeal proposal relates to and the conversion of buildings to residential use which does not fall to be affordable housing or for farming or forestry is not specifically covered. In this respect, the proposal would mark a departure from local development plan policy designed to control development in the countryside. I therefore turn to the particular circumstances of this case which have been put forward by the appellant.

7. There is no apparent dispute between the parties that the 1989 permission does not prevent occupation by the same person for over 10 months each year, however, all year-round occupation is not permitted and therefore the appeal property cannot be occupied as the sole place of residence. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge the appellant's assertion that the increase in occupation time is not significant, the nature of that occupation would change such that the site would be occupied as a single dwelling house removing any need for the occupiers to have an alternative base. This, in itself, does not justify the departure from policy 7 of the LDP.

8. The appeal proposal would also lead to the loss of a tourism unit of accommodation. In this regard, I have had regard to Planning Policy Wales, Edition 10 which states that "in rural areas, tourism-related development is an essential element in providing for a healthy and diverse economy"[2]. I note the appellant states that this does not prevent changes from tourism uses, however, the proposal would lead to the loss of a unit of tourist accommodation which would conflict with the advice within PPW.

9. Furthermore, I have also 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 ("the WBFG Act") and I conclude that the proposed development would result in the loss of a unit of tourist accommodation which would conflict with the duty to improve the economic well-being of Wales. In reaching this decision, I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and I 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 set out as required by section 8 of the WBFG Act.

10. In relation to the sustainability of the location, the appeal site lies approximately 4 miles from the closest settlement, St Davids, and has no direct access to public services, shops and facilities. Without any regular public bus service, the appellant accepts that ownership of at least one family car would be necessary. This however is contradicted within the appellant's evidence which also states that a distance of four miles to St. Davids is not a significant distance to walk or cycle.

11. The appellant has suggested that a condition requiring a car charging point and cycle storage would be acceptable, however, whilst the site may be within range of local centres for an electric car, the overarching intention of PPW is that development

[2] 5.5.3

should be located so that it can be well serviced by infrastructure, since access to services including education and health facilities "underpin economic competitiveness and opportunities for households and businesses to achieve socially and environmentally desirable ways of living and working"[3] Therefore, the whilst an electronic charging point would facilitate transportation without reliance on fossil fuels, this is not the only reason for avoiding reliance on private motor vehicles to access services. In this case, whilst four miles may be a walkable distance for many, it would not be realistic to walk this distance for day-to-day activities such as access to schools, work or food shopping, particularly since the surrounding highway network is generally without street lighting or footways. For this reason, the appeal proposal would conflict with policy 52 of the LDP which requires that accessibility should be promoted and car travel reduced and policy 7 which also states that accessibility to the centres will be an important consideration.

Affordable Housing Contribution

12. A Unilateral Undertaking pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) has been submitted by the appellant, however, as I have found that the proposed development would be unacceptable, I have not considered this document further.

Conclusion

13. For the aforementioned reasons, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Janine Townsley

Inspector

[3] 3.57