
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/W/25/3364011

Nuthatch Grove, High Scrubs Wood, Kiln Road, Tring

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 6, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GDPO).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Arron Jones against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01953/ADG.
 - The development proposed is described as forestry building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In my banner heading above, I have taken the address from the application form.
3. On land used for the purposes of forestry, subject to meeting a number of criteria, planning permission is granted for the erection of a building reasonably necessary for those purposes, under Part 6, Class E of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO). If it met those criteria, the proposed building would comprise “permitted development”. It is not disputed between the parties that a forestry use has been established at the appeal site and therefore, it is a question of whether the building is reasonably necessary. Class E does not contain an upper size limit for forestry buildings, and therefore it is a matter of judgement as to what is ‘reasonably necessary’ for forestry purposes.

Main Issue

4. Whether the proposal is reasonably necessary for forestry purposes in order to comprise permitted development under Part 6, Class E of the GPDO.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises an approximately 4.8-acre plot of land that lies within a wider area of woodland known as High Scrubs Wood. It is accessed off Kiln Road via an unmade track.
6. The proposed building would measure approximately 12m x 8m x 4.5m (to the ridge) and would be timber clad with a sheet metal roof. It is intended to provide storage for tools, including, but not limited to, a sawmill and a forklift and would be used for the milling and drying of long timber lengths.

7. Limited information has been provided as to the scale of the forestry such as the amount of timber that would be taken from the land, and which tools would need to be stored on site, and which ones could reasonably be brought in as and when required. Even considering the need to store larger items I consider that the size of the proposed building would be excessive in relation to the land to which it relates and for the forestry purposes for which it is sought.
8. The building would be of a simple utilitarian design with a pitched roof. It would be timber clad with a sheet metal roof, which would be appropriate in this context. However, even though the building would be well screened by surrounding woodland it would be a substantial building.
9. Overall, I am not satisfied that sufficient detail has been provided to establish that the scale of the proposed building is reasonably necessary for the purposes of forestry. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not constitute permitted development.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellant's assertion that they have taken stewardship of the land and have enhanced the wildlife and flora and fauna at the site. I appreciate the personal benefits the appellant states that the ownership and management of the woodland contribute to his well-being. Nevertheless, these are not matters that would affect whether the building is reasonably necessary for forestry purposes.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other buildings allowed in the locality. Whilst I have been provided with application references, I have not been provided with full details of the cases. In their evidence the Council indicates that these other buildings are not comparable in size to the appeal proposal before me. They go on to state that a building proximate to the appeal site was constructed larger than the approved plans. Notwithstanding the presence of other buildings, this does not affect whether the proposed building would be reasonably necessary for forestry purposes.

Conclusion

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

R. Gee

INSPECTOR