The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

Inquiry opened on 10 April 2018

Site visit made on 10 April 2018

by Jessica Graham BA (Hons) PgDipL

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2018

Appeal A Ref: APP/J9497/W/15/3140928
The Hillyfield, Hillyfield Plantation and Tom's Brake, Land lying south of Harbourneford, South Brent, Devon TQ10 9DT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 6, Paragraph E.2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr D King-Smith against the decision of Dartmoor National Park Authority.
- The application Ref 0259/15, dated 7 May 2015, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2015.
- The development proposed is one storage barn of timber frame construction, with straw bale infill and external timber cladding and corrugated metal roof, to be used for storing tools and machinery; and one storage barn of timber pole construction with corrugated metal roof, to be used for drying timber.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed

Appeal B Ref: APP/J9497/C/16/3146596
The Hillyfield, Hillyfield Plantation and Tom's Brake, Land lying south of Harbourneford, South Brent, Devon TQ10 9DT

- The appeal was made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal was made by Mr D King-Smith against an enforcement notice issued by Dartmoor National Park Authority.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 27 January 2016.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the change of use of the Land from agricultural use to a mixed use for :
    a) Agriculture
    b) Residential purposes
    c) Recreational purposes
    d) Running courses and activities available to the public, with or without payment

  Together with:
    e) The siting of caravans used for residential purposes in the approximate position shown marked "E" on the Plan
    f) The siting of a tented yurt type structure used for residential purposes in the approximate position shown marked "D" on the Plan
    g) The siting of two lorry bodies used for storage purposes in the approximate position shown marked "C" on the Plan
    h) The siting of a tented structure used as a field kitchen in the approximate position shown marked "A" on the Plan
    i) The siting of a tented structure used as a workshop in the approximate position shown marked "B" on the Plan

- The requirements of the notice, as varied by the Notice Under Section 173A of the 1990 Act issued by Dartmoor National Park Authority on 20 December 2016, are to
  1) Permanently cease using the Land for all uses other than agriculture and forestry; and
  2) Permanently remove from the Land the structures identified in paragraphs 3(e) to (i) of the Notice, including all debris and materials.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is six months.
- The appeal was proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a),(c),(d) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

This Appeal was withdrawn at the Inquiry

Appeal C Ref: APP/J9497/C/16/3146597
The Hillyfield, Hillyfield Plantation and Tom's Brake, Land lying south of Harbourneford, South Brent, Devon TQ10 9DT

- The appeal was made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal was made by Mr D King-Smith against an enforcement notice issued by Dartmoor National Park Authority.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 27 January 2016.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, operational development consisting of the erection of:
  (i) two open fronted timber clad single storey buildings with low dual pitched roofs in the approximate position shown marked "X" on the Plan
  (ii) two timber structures, believed to be compost toilets, in the approximate positions marked "F" and "G" on the Plan
  (iii) a timber platform used for siting a yurt, in the approximate position marked "D" on the Plan.
- The requirements of the notice are to permanently remove the Development from the Land, including all debris and materials.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is six months.
- The appeal was proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a),(d) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

This Appeal was withdrawn at the Inquiry

Appeal D Ref: APP/J9497/W/17/3168180
The Hillyfield, Hillyfield Plantation and Tom's Brake, Land lying south of Harbourneford, South Brent, Devon TQ10 9DT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 6, Paragraph E.2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr D King-Smith against the decision of Dartmoor National Park Authority.
- The application Ref 0001/17, dated 19 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2017.
- The development proposed is a barn.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed

Appeal E Ref: APP/J9497/W/17/3191100
The Hillyfield, Hillyfield Plantation and Tom's Brake, Land lying south of Harbourneford, South Brent, Devon TQ10 9DT

- 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 King-Smith against the decision of Dartmoor National Park

Authority.
- The application Ref 0438/17, dated 12 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2017.
- The development proposed was described on the application form as an "ancillary forestry building".

This Appeal was withdrawn at the Inquiry

Procedural matters

1. The inquiry opened on 10 April 2018 and sat for two days. I carried out an accompanied site visit on the afternoon of the first day. On the second day, the appellant withdrew Appeals B, C and E and the Dartmoor National Park Authority ("the DNPA") withdrew its evidence in respect of Appeals A and D. The DNPA also confirmed its agreement that the proposed buildings the subject of Appeals A and D are reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry, within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015.[1]

2. The matters which remain for my consideration are therefore limited to Appeals A and D. These concern three proposed buildings: a tool and machinery store and a timber-drying shed (Appeal A), and a barn to provide covered workspace and a welfare room (Appeal D). Since there is considerable overlap between the procedural and substantive considerations in each appeal, I shall deal with them together. It will be helpful to begin by briefly setting out some background information.

Background

3. "The Hillyfield" is a mixed agriculture and forestry holding, located in the valley of the River Harbourne to the south of Harbourneford. The majority of the site is woodland (11.8ha), which runs along the steep-sided slopes of the valley. This includes designated Ancient Semi Natural Woodland, within which a Plantation on Ancient Woodland Site (PAWS) of Japanese Larch and Douglas Fir was created in the 1970s. The agricultural element of the holding (8ha) is mainly tenanted out and used as grazing for organic sheep and cattle.

4. Historically part of a larger agricultural holding, the appeal site was split from the main farm as it was less productive land. Prior to its purchase by the appellant in 2009 a number of previous owners sought to use it for shooting and fishing, leaving the pasture and woodlands unmanaged. The lower potential productivity of the land, and its limited accessibility, militate against it being brought back into use as a viable enterprise using modern intensive farming and forestry methods.

5. The appellant's approach, as detailed in his Forestry Commission approved Woodland Management Plan, is to eschew mechanised management of the woods in favour of a combination of more labour-intensive techniques, such as coppicing and Continuous Cover Forestry[2], using light machinery, horses and manpower. This approach relies heavily on the extensive engagement of

[1] These matters are confirmed in the written statements provided to the inquiry, signed by the relevant parties, and listed as Documents 7 and 8 on the final page of this Decision Letter.
[2] A system of silviculture which maintains the canopy of the woodland by selective felling, rather than the alternative of clearfelling all the trees in the area. It enables management of the forest ecosystem as a whole, rather than just the trees.

volunteers, who provide labour in exchange for the opportunity to spend time close to nature, learn new skills, and experience the beauty of Dartmoor. The evidence of the appellant is that over 3000 person hours are worked by volunteers on average each year.

6. To date, the active management of the woodland has involved work to remove significant laurel invasion, control bamboo, and address two Statutory Plant Health Notices (SPHNs) requiring the felling of Japanese Larch. This entailed the felling of the PAWS and, while not a requirement of the SPHNs, replanting with mixed native broadleaf and coppice areas. "Hope Wood", which covers some 2.08ha at the southern boundary of the appeal site, was planted in 2010 and contains a mix of native broadleaf varieties. Within the pasture there is a small area given over to agroforestry, currently growing 24 nut trees; a newly planted orchard; an area for growing herbs and berries; willow osier and hedgerows managed for environmental benefit; and rare-breed hens and ducks for sale and egg production.

7. A key element of the Business Model is the sale of local home-grown timber into the local market. Chopped firewood is currently sold to around 50 customers within a 7 mile radius of the site; in order to be saleable, its moisture content needs to be guaranteed as less than 25%. Planks milled on a mobile sawmill, roundwood fence posts and strainers, and roundwood stripped of its bark are sold to a range of local makers and private buyers. Following the construction of a new site access, roundwood timber in loads up to articulated lorry size can now be sold to woodchip biomass fuel producers and to a local firewood supplier, but since this is not a profitable use of timber it only takes place when an immediate cash flow is required.

8. "Rocketlogs", a trademarked "one-log bonfire" are also made on site using a chainsaw, but development of this aspect of the business is still at an early stage. Future plans also include the sale of coppice craft products, barbecue charcoal, biochar, artist charcoal and various non-timber forestry products, such as roots, resin, foliage and berries.

9. The business also includes the provision of educational and recreational events. The evidence of the appellant is that these are restricted to fewer than 28 days per year, and are incidental to the primary use of the land for forestry and agriculture.

Provisions for constructing forestry buildings as Permitted Development

10. Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 as amended ("the GPDO") grants planning permission for classes of development described as Permitted Development in Schedule 2. Class E of Part 6 of Schedule 2 concerns the carrying out, on land used for the purposes of forestry, of development reasonably necessary for those purposes consisting of (among other things) works for the erection of a building.

11. Paragraph E.2 of Part 6 sets out a number of conditions to which development consisting of the erection of a building permitted by Class E will be subject. Condition (1)(a) provides that the developer must, before beginning the development, apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the building.

12. On 7 May 2015 the appellant applied to the DNPA for such a determination in respect of the tool and machinery store and timber-drying shed, and on 19 December 2016 made a further application in respect of the barn. By letters dated 18 June 2015 and 25 January 2017 respectively, the DNPA advised the appellant of its view that neither the tool and machinery store and the timber-drying shed, nor the barn, were reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry on the identified land and that these buildings would not, therefore, constitute Permitted Development. Both of these letters contained the statement "This letter constitutes the Authority's formal decision on the notification".

Main issues

13. There are, then, two main issues for these appeals. Firstly, whether each of the three buildings is reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry; and secondly, if so, whether prior approval is needed for its siting, design and external appearance.

(1) Whether reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry

The tool and machinery shed

14. The evidence of the appellant is that he has invested over £52,000 (supplemented in part by grant support from the Farming and Forestry Investment Scheme led by DEFRA) in machinery and tools used for managing the woodlands, and needs a dry and secure space in which to keep them. The equipment includes machinery such as a tractor, forwarder, winch, sawbench, topper, generators and logging arch and a wide range of hand tools, such as chainsaws, loppers, axes, ladders, saws and scythes. It also includes items of protective clothing, and hazardous materials such as poisons and fuels.

15. There is currently no covered storage for machinery on site, and while tarpaulins and canvas have been used to create temporary shelter, this is inadequate for specialist machinery, which consequently suffers unnecessary damage and deterioration from the elements. Tools and small equipment are kept in a secure lorry, but this is far from ideal as the space is cramped, and suffers from leaks.

16. There is no dispute that the proposed shed would provide protection for the machinery, and other tools and equipment used in the appellant's forestry enterprise, from the extremes of weather experienced on Dartmoor. It would also provide protection from the risks of theft and tampering.

17. In my judgment, the proposed tool and machinery shed clearly meets the requirement of being reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry, and so constitutes Permitted Development within the terms of Class E of Part 6, Schedule 2 of the GPDO.

The timber drying shed

18. The undisputed evidence of the appellant is that a timber-drying shed is essential to the viability of the forestry enterprise: firewood, milled timber, coppice products and charcoal must all be sold clean and dry to find a market, and to build and maintain a network of repeat customers. Adding value in this way to the timber grown on site is a central element of the Business Plan, and underpins the sustainability of the woodland management strategy.

19. The appellant explains that in the absence of suitable covered drying space, the insuperable difficulties of keeping timber that is stacked under canvas or steel sheeting free from damp and mould have meant that for two winters, firewood sales had to stop entirely. A temporary firewood shed was erected in 2015, but provides only limited space, such that in each year the enterprise has sold out of firewood due to the smallness of the stock.

20. Sales of planks have also been held back, since without permanent covered storage they are prone to becoming wet through drip-lines, causing staining and ultimately rot. The risk of damage from staining means it is not worth the investment in milling the timber in advance, so the appellant has been cutting to order where a customer has a workable lead-in time, but this has meant many orders have been missed due to not having stock to sell on demand.

21. The proposed drying shed would enable the enterprise to increase sales of firewood grown on site, through the provision of storage adequate to allow proper seasoning. It would also facilitate the lengthy seasoning required for planks, and I note that a number of local businesses, keen to secure a reliable supply of locally-grown timber, have expressed strong interest in making future purchases.

22. In my judgment, the adding of value to wood grown on site through seasoning and appropriate storage is part and parcel of the forestry enterprise at The Hillyfield. I conclude that the proposed timber-drying shed clearly meets the requirement of being reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry, and so constitutes Permitted Development within the terms of Class E of Part 6, Schedule 2 of the GPDO.

The barn

23. As discussed above, the business model for The Hillyfield is to use a mixture of traditional and progressive techniques for woodland management, rather than pursue an intensive, highly mechanised approach. This method relies heavily on the engagement of volunteers, to carry out work throughout the year. Some provide their labour for a few days, some for weeks, and some for longer.

24. Meals for the volunteers are currently prepared and taken in the field kitchen, a tented structure which also serves as a space for tea breaks, rest, first aid, meetings and briefings. A further structure, which has a canvas roof but open sides, is currently used as a covered workspace when the weather is too wet to work outdoors. Activities include making rocketlogs, fixing and sharpening tools, coppice work, and making timber items required for use on the holding such as fence posts, gates and tree stakes. The appellant explains that this space is cramped and inadequate; rain and snow can blow in, and the floor is often wet and dirty.

25. The proposed barn is intended to replace these two structures, accommodating the welfare facilities and covered workspace within a single structure and thus reducing the need for movement around the site. The barn would consist of a sizeable open-fronted workspace, a smaller enclosed workspace, and a welfare area providing a dry rest space, kitchen/dining area, and washing facilities.

26. There is no dispute that the barn would better meet the need to provide adequate welfare facilities for the volunteers working on the appeal site. It would also provide a secure and dry space to work on jobs which require

protection from the elements, enabling the enterprise to improve its current productivity and working conditions.

27. In my judgment, the proposed barn meets the requirement of being reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry, and so constitutes Permitted Development within the terms of Class E of Part 6, Schedule 2 of the GPDO.

Conclusions on the first main issue

28. I find that all three proposed buildings are reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry, and since they do not conflict with any of the other exceptions and limitations specified by Class E of Part 6, Schedule 2 to the GPDO, constitute Permitted Development under the terms of that Class. This means that construction of the buildings is acceptable in principle.

(2) Whether prior approval is required

29. As set out above, the DNPA's response to the appellant's applications for determinations as to whether prior approval would be required was to issue decisions stating that it did not consider the buildings to be Permitted Development.

30. Paragraph E.2(1) of Schedule 2 to the GPDO sets out the conditions to which development permitted by Class E will be subject. These include, at E.2(1)(c), the condition that (in summary) the proposed development must not begin until either (i) the applicant has received written notice from the local planning authority of its determination that prior approval is not required; or (ii) where the authority give the applicant notice (within 28 days following the date of receiving the applicant's application) of their determination that prior approval is required, the giving of such approval; or (iii) the expiry of 28 days following the date on which the application was received by the authority, without the authority making any determination as to whether prior approval is required, or notifying the applicant of their determination.

31. On a strict interpretation, sub section (iii) is relevant here: the DNPA does not on the face of it appear to have made a formal determination as to whether prior approval would be required or not, but has simply notified the appellant that it did not consider the buildings to be Permitted Development. Since I have determined that the buildings do constitute Permitted Development, and since 28 days following the date on which the application was received by the authority have expired, it is now arguably the case (as set out in Mr Shorten's proof of evidence) that the pre-commencement conditions of paragraph E.2(1) have been duly discharged, such that the appellant may lawfully erect the proposed buildings.

32. However, in response to my questions at the inquiry, Counsel for the appellant confirmed that he did not wish to pursue that argument, and urged that I determine the appeals on the basis that the question of the requirement or otherwise for prior approval is before me. Counsel for the DNPA concurred with that suggested approach. I appreciate that there is room for doubt as to the correct interpretation of the decisions issued by the DNPA in response to the applications, and so in the interests of clarity I shall proceed to determine whether or not prior approval of the siting, design and external appearance of the buildings is needed.

33. In response to my questions at the inquiry, the DNPA advised that on the basis of the information provided, it had no concerns about the siting, design and external appearance of any of the three proposed buildings.

34. In this context, I note that condition (1)(b) of paragraph E.2 of Part 6, Schedule 2 to the GPDO sets out the information which "must" accompany an application for determination as to whether prior approval will be required. This is limited to a written description of the proposed development; the materials to be used; and a plan indicating the site. In this case, the appellant also provided scaled plans and elevations detailing the siting, design, appearance and dimensions of each proposed building. Condition (1)(e) of paragraph E.2 provides that where prior approval is not required, development must be carried out in accordance with the details submitted with the application. I interpret this to mean *all* of the details submitted with the application, not just those required by condition (1)(b).

35. I have therefore taken these plans into account in my consideration of whether or not prior approval is required. It will be helpful to look in turn at each of the specific matters which could, potentially, require prior approval.

Siting

36. The tool and machinery store and the timber-drying shed would both be sited in the old quarry, a part of the appeal site which has level ground, no trees, is well screened and is outside any areas of flood risk.

37. The barn would be sited directly adjacent to the existing Forestry Hardstanding, which was constructed[3] to facilitate the storage and handling of timber, and the turning of vehicles. This location accords with the findings of a community consultation exercise conducted by the appellant in 2012, which provided support for moving the noisier aspects of the forestry enterprise (such as firewood processing and cutting timber) out of the old quarry and further into the woods. Siting the barn, containing the covered workspace and welfare facilities, next to the hardstanding would facilitate more productive and efficient work. This location also has the benefit of access to running water.

Design and external appearance

38. The tool and machinery store would be of timber frame construction, infilled with straw bales on a blockwork plinth, and clad externally in larch timber boarding grown on site. Externally the walls would measure some 10.3m by 14.3m, but due to the straw bale infilling the usable internal floor space would be around 8.8m by 12.8m. The incorporation of the straw bales is intended to reduce any noise disturbance from the occasional maintenance of machinery within the barn, and to help provide a suitably dry environment.

39. The appellant has demonstrated that the size of the building has been kept to the minimum necessary, by providing a drawing showing that the machinery, tools and other equipment that the shed is intended to house would fit, but only just. Externally, the structure would have a simple, functional form with large doors to allow machinery access, a pitched roof with a 3m overhang to create a lean-to on the southern side, and a small solar array on the roof.

[3] with planning permission (ref: 0040/17)

40. The timber-drying shed would be a roundwood timber-framed pole barn, with an open front and wooden slatted sides to allow the free circulation of air. It would measure some 7.9m deep by 24.4m long, to allow for six 4m wide drying and storage bays with adequate space between stacks. The pitched roof would have a ridge height of 5.7m, and aside from the roof cladding, the shed would be constructed entirely from timber grown on site. The undisputed evidence of the appellant is that size has been kept to a minimum, and that significant volumes of timber will still require storage outside under covers, before being moved into the shed for final drying prior to sale.

41. The shed would have a simple, traditional appearance; its slatted sides and open front would render its contents, and its function, clearly apparent.

42. The barn containing the covered workspace and welfare facilities would also be a timber-framed structure, with a pitched roof over sides clad with larch timber boarding grown on site. It would have a footprint of some 20m by 8m, and a ridge height of 5.5m. The structure would have three distinct, but clearly related, elements: an open-fronted central workspace some 11m wide, flanked by a 4m wide enclosed and lockable workspace at one end, and the 5m wide welfare area at the other.

43. The barn has been designed to allow enough space to handle long lengths of timber and coppice material, and to work using hand tools and chainsaws while undercover (with sufficient ventilation to ensure safe dispersal of fumes). It would front on to, and have a visual and functional connection with, the forestry hardstanding used to store and handle the timber grown on site.

Conclusions on the second main issue

44. In my judgment, it is clear from the information submitted with the applications that each of the three buildings would be appropriately sited, in the locations best suited to their intended uses. Their simple forms and traditional timber-framed construction reflects that of farm and forestry buildings historically used throughout the National Park, and together with the use of timber cladding grown and made on site, would ensure that their design and external appearance would be wholly in keeping with their functional and visual context as working buildings on a managed forestry holding.

45. That being the case, I see no reason to conclude that prior approval of any further details concerning the siting, design or external appearance of any of the three buildings should be required.

Conclusions

46. For the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposed tool and machinery store, the proposed timber-drying shed and the proposed barn each constitute Permitted Development under Class E of Part 6, Schedule 2 to the GPDO. I have also determined that, on the applications made in accordance with condition E.2(1)(a) of Class E, prior approval is not required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the buildings. I therefore conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

47. The planning permission granted for the three buildings under Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 6, Class E of the GPDO is subject to the conditions set out at paragraph E.2(1)(e) and (f). These require respectively that the development must, except to the extent that the local planning authority otherwise agree in

writing, be carried out in accordance with the details submitted with the application; and that the development must be carried out within a period of 5 years from the date on which the local planning authority were given the information required to be submitted with the application.

Formal decisions

Appeal A

48. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is not required under the provisions of Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 6, Paragraph E.2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for one storage barn of timber frame construction, with straw bale infill and external timber cladding and corrugated metal roof, to be used for storing tools and machinery and one storage barn of timber pole construction with corrugated metal roof, to be used for drying timber, at The Hillyfield, Hillyfield Plantation and Tom's Brake, Land lying south of Harbourneford, South Brent, Devon TQ10 9DT.

Appeal D

49. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is not required under the provisions of Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 6, Paragraph E.2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for a barn at The Hillyfield, Hillyfield Plantation and Tom's Brake, Land lying south of Harbourneford, South Brent, Devon TQ10 9DT.

Jessica Graham

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY:

Mr S Whale, of Counsel	Instructed by Ms H Union, Solicitor for the National Park Authority

His witnesses were Mr C Dutton, Mr P Leaver and Mr J Aven. They were not called.

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr S Cottle, of Counsel	Instructed by Mr D King-Smith, under the Direct Access Provisions

He called

Mr D King-Smith	The Appellant

His other witnesses were Ms L Cole, Mr G Watt and Mr J Shorten. They were not called.

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Dr T Greeves	Chair of the Dartmoor Society
Mr J Brazil	Devon County Councillor, South Hams District Councillor, former member of DNPA; appearing in his personal capacity
Mr N Legg	Harbourneford resident
Ms H Tiffen	Former Sustainable Development Officer at DNPA
Ms J Dean	Harbourneford resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

1 Rebuttal Evidence from Ms Cole, Mr Watt, Mr King-Smith and Mr Shorten, submitted by the appellant
2 Copy of the opening submissions made on behalf of the appellant
3 Copy of the opening submissions made on behalf of DNPA
4 List of "Core Documents" associated with Mr Leaver's proof of evidence, provided by the appellant
5 Draft Statement of Common Ground
6 Copy of drg.no. HF-MPB-RP-20170606 in re Appeal E, previously missing from the papers provided for the Inspector
7 Written confirmation from the appellant of the withdrawal of Appeals B, C and E
8 Written confirmation from DNPA of the withdrawal of its evidence in Appeals A and D, and its agreement that the proposed buildings the subject of those appeals are reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry within the meaning of Class E, Part 6, Schedule 2 of the GPDO 2015.