

## APPEALS

### The following appeals have been received since my last report to Committee:-

<b>CODE NO.</b>	A/16/3162383 (1788)
<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	P/16/318/FUL
<b>APPELLANT</b>	MR T KOSTIC
<b>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</b>	EXTENSION TO CEFN CRIBBWR GARAGE'S EXISTING HARD SURFACE PARKING AREA: EAST OF CEFN CRIBBWR GARAGE, CEFN ROAD, CEFN CRIBBWR
<b>PROCEDURE</b>	WRITTEN REPS
<b>DECISION LEVEL</b>	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development, by reason of its location in a rural area and form, constitutes an undesirable extension of urban development outside the settlement boundary of Cefn Cribbwr, that would be prejudicial to the character of the area in which it is intended that the existing uses of land shall remain for the most part undisturbed, contrary to established national and local planning policies and would set an undesirable precedent for further applications for similar development in this area to the detriment of visual amenities, contrary to Policies SP4, ENV1, SP2 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2013) and guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 8, Jan 2016)

---

<b>CODE NO.</b>	A/16/3164386 (1789)
<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	P/16/630/OUT
<b>APPELLANT</b>	MR G MORRIS
<b>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</b>	2 SELF CATERING SINGLE STOREY LOG CABIN HOLIDAY LET UNITS: FORMER PLAYGROUND SITE FOUNTAIN ROAD ABERKENFIG
<b>PROCEDURE</b>	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
<b>DECISION LEVEL</b>	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development, by reason of its countryside location, constitutes an undesirable sporadic development outside any existing settlement boundary, would be prejudicial to the character of the area in which it is intended that the existing uses of land shall remain for the most part undisturbed, would be contrary to established National and Local planning policies and would set an undesirable precedent for further applications for similar development in this area, contrary to Policy ENV1 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2013).
  2. The proposed access lacks adequate visibility for vehicles emerging from the site, which is likely to create hazards to the detriment of highway safety in and around the site contrary to Policy SP2 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2013).
-

**The following appeals have been decided since my last report to Committee:-**

**CODE NO.** A/16/3156036 (1779)

**APPELLANT** CORNERSTONE CONSTRUCTION

**SUBJECT OF APPEAL** DETACHED DWELLING; LAND ADJACENT TO 13 HEOL TRE DWR WATERTON

**PROCEDURE** WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

**DECISION LEVEL** DELEGATED OFFICER

**DECISION** **THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE ALLOWED SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS**

A copy of this appeal decision is attached as APPENDIX A.

---

**CODE NO.** A/16/3158471 (1782)

**APPELLANT** MR ROBERT ROBINSON

**SUBJECT OF APPEAL** SINGLE STOREY DWELLING ON FORMER STORAGE SITE: THE YARD LALESTON ROAD CEFN CRIBBWR

**PROCEDURE** WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

**DECISION LEVEL** DELEGATED OFFICER

**DECISION** **THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE DISMISSED.**

A copy of this appeal decision is attached as APPENDIX B.

---

**CODE NO.** A/16/3158329 (1786)

**APPELLANT** PAULA HUGHES

**SUBJECT OF APPEAL** DETACHED GARAGE AND STORE: LAND AT DAN YR EGLWYS BETTWS

**PROCEDURE** HOUSEHOLDER

**DECISION LEVEL** DELEGATED OFFICER

**DECISION** **THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE ALLOWED SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS.**

A copy of this appeal decision is attached as APPENDIX C.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the report of the Corporate Director Communities be noted.

**MARK SHEPHARD  
CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES**

**Background Papers**

(see relevant application reference number).

# Appendix A



The Planning Inspectorate  
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

---

## Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 13/10/16 & 15/11/16

gan P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 18.11.2016

## Appeal Decision

Site visits made on 13/10/16 & 15/11/16

by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 18.11.2016

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F6915/A/16/3156036**

**Site address: Land adjacent to 13 Heol Tre Dwr, Waterton, Bridgend CF31 3AJ**

**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 Cornerstone Construction Bridgend Ltd against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
  - The application Ref P/16/165/FUL, dated 24 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2016.
  - The development proposed is a detached dwelling.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached dwelling on land adjacent to 13 Heol Tre Dwr, Waterton, Bridgend CF31 3AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/16/165/FUL, dated 24 February 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

## Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the provision of open space and children's play facilities in the area.

## Reasons

3. It is evident that a playground facility historically existed at Heol Tre Dwr. Subsequent planning permissions for housing, including the appeal site, have since required that provision be made for a children's play area as a replacement facility. However, despite housing being built some time ago, now comprised of 13 and 14 Heol Tre Dwr, no formal play facilities were ever provided, and there is nothing to suggest that the Council took any enforcement action to secure the provision.
  4. The Council considers that the appeal site represents a replacement play area and constitutes an informal recreation space that has been accessed by the local community. However, the rationale for requiring such provision historically is not explained or quantified against any identified need or recognised deficiency in children's play provision in the locality at that time. In addition, the current development plan does not designate the land for community purposes, nor is the
-

land included in the Council's most recent audit of open space carried out in 2010. In my view, the fact that it was always the intention to provide a replacement facility is not sufficient in itself to formally recognise the site as an existing community facility.

5. The appeal site and adjoining land is unsecured and contained some play equipment at the time of my visits. Nonetheless the equipment that I saw is largely of a household and transportable nature that is not formally or permanently laid out. In particular, I observed that the general appearance and nature of the site and adjacent land is such that it does not appear as a public play facility. In these circumstances, I consider that it has limited value in terms of the wider objectives of creating healthy, sustainable and inclusive communities. I accept that it is informally used by some residents living in close vicinity, and has some benefit as a visual green space, but I would not regard it as an outdoor recreation or a social or community facility in the context of Policies SP13 or COM7 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (LDP).
6. Even so, the Council has not provided any empirical data that demonstrates the need for a children's play area in this location, or that any such requirement has been assessed in the light of existing provision, for example that the quantity or quality of existing provision is inadequate or under threat. In particular, there is no information such as an assessment of need or an up to date audit of existing facilities to determine the level of need that would be generated by the development. I note that an audit is being prepared but no further details have been provided.
7. I understand the desire of local residents to retain the land for community purposes, however on the available evidence, there is no justification that a contribution to public open space/children's play facilities is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. I conclude that the proposal would not have any harmful effect on the provision of open space or children's play facilities and there would be no conflict with the aims of LDP Policies SP2, SP13 and COM7.

#### **Other Matters**

8. There is some dispute over landownership and rights, including access to existing drainage infrastructure, but these are civil matters that do not fall before me for judgement. It would be for the developer to ensure that the necessary legal consents are in place and this planning permission would not convey any such rights in that regard.
9. I have had regard to concerns regarding drainage, but the Council's drainage department does not object to the proposal subject to conditions which I have imposed as I consider necessary and reasonable. It would be for the developer and the Council to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with these conditions.
10. There is a large Oak tree sited towards the rear of the site that owing to its stature and prominence has significant amenity value, and I understand that it is protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The Design and Access Statement confirms that some works will be carried out to the tree, including the removal of one branch and crown lifting/thinning. There are no adverse comments from the Council's ecologist, and a tree protection condition is recommended. I have no reason to disagree with this recommendation and have imposed a condition accordingly.

### **Conditions**

11. In addition to the conditions discussed above, I have attached the standard time commencement and plans compliance conditions. I consider that a condition relating to any works to the Oak tree is necessary to safeguard its future health, but the condition suggested by the Council is vague and I do not have the details submitted with the said application P/06/1099/FUL. Accordingly I have attached a similar condition that has the same aim. A condition relating to replacement trees is necessary in the interests of visual amenity and finally a condition relating to the completion of the driveway in permanent materials is necessary to ensure there is no risk to highway safety. In the interests of preciseness and enforceability I have amended the wording of some of the Council's suggested conditions without changing their overall aim.

### **Conclusions**

12. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

*P J Davies*

**INSPECTOR**

### **Schedule of Conditions**

- 1) The development shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: 015: 28/01, 02, 03, 04, 05 and 06.
- 3) No development shall commence until details of a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of future maintenance requirements and shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development, and retained in perpetuity.
- 4) No development shall commence on site until a ground investigation report and infiltration test, sufficient to support the design parameters and suitability of any proposed infiltration system, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development.
- 5) No development nor any site clearance shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority details of a scheme for the protection of the Oak tree shown to be retained on drawing number 015: 28/01. The approved scheme shall be implemented before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development and shall be retained throughout the course of the development. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced/protected in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within the protected areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

- 6) No development shall take place until the details of any works to the protected Oak tree on the site have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. These works shall be carried out as agreed and in accordance with a timescale to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
- 7) No development shall commence until details of the replacement trees have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The agreed trees shall be planted in the first planting season following the completion or occupation of the development, whichever is the sooner.
- 8) The dwelling shall not be occupied until the driveway has been completed in permanent materials and the driveway shall thereafter be retained in permanent materials.

## Appendix B



---

### **Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl**

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 29/11/16

**gan Paul Selby BEng (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru**

**Dyddiad: 08.12.2016**

### **Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 29/11/16

**by Paul Selby BEng (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers**

**Date: 08.12.2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F6915/A/16/3158471**

**Site address: The Yard, Laleston Road, Cefn Cribwr CF32 0EU**

**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 Robert Robertson against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
  - The application Ref P/16/324/FUL, dated 26 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
  - The development proposed is Single residential dwelling on former storage site.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Procedural Matter**

2. The Council has referred to pending enforcement action relating to the levelling of the appeal site and laying of hardcore and gravel. Such matters are not before me and I have proceeded to consider the appeal on the basis of the lawfully permitted use.

### **Main Issues**

3. The main issues are: a) the effect of the proposal on highway safety; b) the sustainability of the location for residential development; and c) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to local policy relating to development outside settlement limits.

### **Reasons**

4. The appeal site is located adjacent to Laleston Road southeast of Cefn Cribwr, a linear settlement which comprises a mix of dwellings of various designs and small scale commercial buildings. The site, which is located outside the settlement boundary designated in the Bridgend Local Development Plan (LDP), is long and narrow and incorporates hard standings associated with a previous steel framed industrial structure. Bounded by a hedgerow at its frontage with the adjacent lane, two detached residential dwellings lie to the south and east, a builders' yard is situated
-



immediately north of the site and agricultural land lies beyond a post-and-wire fence to the west.

*Highway safety / sustainability of location*

5. The proposed dwelling would be somewhat remote from the services provided in the village centre, which lies over 1 kilometre west along the main B4281 road. Whilst two bus stops served by three regular routes are located on the main road in close proximity to the site, the route to these bus stops would require pedestrians to walk for around 100 metres on or at the edge of the carriageway of Laleston Road from the access point of the proposed dwelling to the junction of Cefn Cross, where a continuous footway begins.
6. I saw on my site visit that the alignment of Laleston Road provides good visibility for motorists travelling northwards. Furthermore, drivers travelling in this direction are likely to reduce their speed when approaching the junction. Nevertheless, the refuge area beyond the white line marking the edge of the carriageway is substantially limited, and in some areas non-existent. Achieving safe refuge from passing cars would be particularly challenging for residents using wheelchairs or pushchairs, or were northbound drivers to meet with vehicles travelling south. Although the appeal proposal is for only one dwelling, and I note that no recent accidents have been reported along this 30 mph route, I consider that the absence of a demarcated footway between the appeal site and the junction would materially increase the risk of vehicle and pedestrian conflicts, with consequent unacceptable impacts on highway safety.
7. The lack of street lighting near to the appeal site would further reduce the safety of pedestrians outside of daylight hours. I note that the appellant has suggested the use of low-level lighting to improve night-time visibility, but from the details submitted I am not satisfied that such lighting would provide acceptable illumination between the appeal site and junction. In any case, the provision of lighting would not ameliorate the absence of a footway or demarcated pedestrian refuge area.
8. Whilst the site is theoretically accessible by a range of transport modes, the unsafe pedestrian access to the village centre and bus stops would, in my view, act as a disincentive for future occupants of the appeal dwelling to travel on foot or by bus. In addition, I consider that the relatively limited width of the B4281 and volume of traffic using the road would be likely to deter many potential residents from taking local trips by bike. Consequently, I find that the site does not have adequate accessibility to a range of sustainable transport modes or good access to key services and facilities, and that future residents would therefore be likely to rely on private motor vehicles.
9. I note that a certificate of lawful development was issued in 2013 (ref: P/12/697/LAE) for the storage of building materials and furniture, including a shed. The appellant has submitted a technical note which estimates that the lawful use would be likely to generate around 20 two-way trips per day, as opposed to around 5 two-way trips for the proposed residential use. I do not dispute those figures, but transport movements associated with the extant use would be mainly associated with vehicles transporting bulky items between the site and a range of other locations. The transport impacts of the proposed residential use would be materially different, being influenced by more regular journeys accessing workplaces or services, including by foot, thus justifying a location prioritising safe access to a range of transport modes, rather than a peripheral location providing access to the highway network.

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the design and sustainability objectives of policy SP2 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (LDP) to ensure that development includes good walking, cycling, public transport and road connections, and would also conflict with the highway safety and transport objectives of Planning Policy Wales Edition 9 (PPW) and Manual for Streets.

*Character and appearance / settlement limit*

11. In line with PPW, LDP policy ENV1 promotes the development of previously developed land in preference to greenfield sites. Whilst there is little doubt in my mind that the appeal site represents previously developed land, the proposed residential use does not meet any of the exceptions outlined in the policy as being "acceptable in principle in the countryside". However, the reasoned justification clarifies that the intent of policy ENV1 is to protect the countryside for its own sake and, in relation to the appeal proposal, the most relevant factor appears to be landscape quality.
12. The openness of the appeal site currently affords it a close visual association with the agricultural land beyond, but were it to return to its lawful use, it would have the appearance of a small-scale, peripheral industrial use. Nevertheless, with or without industrial structures or items stored on the land, the appeal site and neighbouring builders' yard isolate the nearby dwellings to the south and east from the confines of the settlement, such that they appear as two isolated dwellings in the open countryside. I consider that, even were the site to revert to its lawful use, the character and appearance of this section of Laleston Road would be influenced primarily by its semi-rural setting.
13. Although the low height and form of the dormer bungalow would diminish its bulk, and the proposed plantings within the hedgerow would assist in partially screening the building, the dwelling would be located in close proximity to the western site boundary on land higher than the lane and would appear as a prominent and overtly domestic feature in nearby views. Whilst the visual impacts of structures within the curtilage of the dwelling could be reduced via a condition to limit Permitted Development rights, I consider that the appeal proposal would be perceived as part of a cluster of residential dwellings with those adjacent, and would have the effect of materially extending the settlement into the open countryside, harming the prevailing rural character of the immediate area.
14. I accept that replacing an industrial use with a modest residential dwelling may result in visual benefits to the character and appearance of the site itself, but this would be substantially outweighed by the harmful visual effect of the proposal as a sprawling ribbon development adjacent to a lane of rural character. Furthermore, as already outlined, I consider that the provision of a dwelling on the site would lead to inevitable highway safety measures which would be likely to have an urbanising and materially harmful visual impact on Laleston Road.
15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would represent an unacceptable incursion into the open countryside and would thus not accord with the locational and landscape objectives of LDP policies ENV1 and PLA1.

**Other Matters**

16. The Council has referred to a previously refused application for a residential development to the south of site and an appeal decision from 2012 relating to a site outside Ewenny (Ref: APP/F6915/A/12/2174146). The refused application lies in close proximity to the appeal site, and both schemes appear to share some characteristics

with the proposal. Nevertheless, from the information submitted, the site circumstances for both cases appear to be materially different to that before me, particularly in terms of the extant use. I have therefore proceeded to determine the appeal proposal based on the specific merits of the case, and afford these other examples limited weight.

17. I acknowledge that the proposal would increase the supply of housing locally, but whilst I afford this significant weight, it does not outweigh the identified harm.
18. I have 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). In reaching my 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 in section 8 of the WBFG Act.

### **Conclusion**

19. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Paul Selby*

INSPECTOR

## Appendix C



The Planning Inspectorate  
Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

---

### **Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl**

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 29/11/16

**gan Paul Selby BEng (Hons) MSc  
MRTPI**

**Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru**

**Dyddiad: 07.12.2016**

### **Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 29/11/16

**by Paul Selby BEng (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers**

**Date: 07.12.2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F6915/A/16/3158329**

**Site address: Land at Dan yr Eglwys (Ty Newydd Farm), Bettws, Bridgend CF32 8TJ**

**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 Paula Hughes against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
  - The application Ref P/16/506/FUL, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2016.
  - The proposal is Detached garage.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Detached garage at Land at Dan yr Eglwys (Ty Newydd Farm), Bettws, Bridgend CF32 8TJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, P/16/506/FUL, dated 16 June 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision letter.

### **Procedural Matter**

2. Although the development has been largely completed, the appeal seeks retrospective planning permission to reduce the length of the existing structure, amongst other building works.

### **Main Issue**

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to local policy relating to development outside settlement limits.

### **Reasons**

4. The appeal site is located in a fringe countryside setting on a hillside overlooking a steep valley, and forms part of an extensive curtilage of a residential property located mainly outside the settlement boundary defined in the Bridgend Local Development Plan (LDP). The site lies at the terminus of a small, modern housing development featuring dwellings of various designs and placements within plots, located at the edge of Bettws, a small settlement of mixed character. The hedgerows, trees, wooded
-

slopes and fragmented field pattern of the valley beyond the settlement edge affords the setting of Bettws an intrinsically rural character.

5. The site hosts a substantially complete garage and first floor storeroom constructed of rendered block and slate to match the host dwelling, which lies a short distance to the south, and located adjacent to the boundary wall of 4 Dan yr Eglwys. From the information before me I understand the dimensions of the as-built garage to be 6.5 metres high, 10 metres long and 6.9 metres deep. The constructed building is thus significantly larger in scale to a permitted garage and store on the same site (Ref: P/12/714/FUL), being around 0.5 metres higher and over 2 metres longer. The site has also been the subject of previous appeals (Refs: APP/F6915/A/12/2174140, APP/F6915/C/15/3139097 and APP/F6915/A/15/3137898). These appeal decisions are recent, dating from 2012 and 2016, and I afford them significant weight.
6. The settlement edge of Bettws is poorly defined in places, but in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site there is a relatively strong building line of residential dwellings and ancillary outbuildings with rear elevations facing towards the valley. The constructed building is orientated similarly to Nos 2 and 3 Dan yr Eglwys, and in many nearby views it has a domestic appearance that belies its ancillary nature. The height of the existing garage is reflected in a building of extensive length, with a conventional, pitched roof form and high eaves. Whilst views of the appeal site from the west are somewhat limited by distance and tree cover, the bulk of the existing garage is amplified by its position on the hillside at the settlement edge. I thereby concur with the previous Inspector, who found the as-built garage to read as a large modern building of urban appearance and form, and which is perceived as a material incursion into the countryside from many viewpoints.
7. The appeal proposal would reduce the length of the existing structure by around 2.8 metres. Whilst there would be no reduction in height, the proposed modifications would significantly reduce the apparent scale and bulk of the garage. Although certain domestic features would remain, such as rooflights and windows, when compared to the scale and overtly domestic appearance of the host dwelling the appeal proposal would appear as a clearly ancillary structure. The garage would remain substantially separated from the host dwelling, but given the character and extent of the wider curtilage, which includes paddocks and small agricultural structures, the reduced length would afford the appeal building the appearance of a utilitarian structure and a component element of the wider landholding. Consequently, whilst the appeal site lies outside the designated LDP settlement limits and beyond the boundary wall of No 4, the reduced scale and bulk of the garage, combined with its siting no further west than the neighbouring dwellings and structures to the north and south, would allow it to be perceived as an integral part of the settlement.
8. The staircase, railings and screen at the northern elevation would be inconspicuously located, but constructed in metal they would give the building a domestic appearance reflective of the balconies present on the rear elevations of dwellings nearby. The current absence of garage doors assists in affording the existing structure a semi-rural character, but those proposed would further enhance the domestic appearance of the building. However, the proposed reduction in the number of garage doors from three to two would significantly reduce their prominence. A condition requiring the approval of details of materials to be used in the construction of the garage doors, staircase, railings and screen would further mitigate visual impacts by ensuring the use of appropriate building materials, such as timber, to reflect the position of the garage at the settlement edge and its orientation facing the valley. Additional landscaping along

the western boundary of the site, secured via conditions, would further mitigate the visual impact of the appeal building from the west and would also serve to define the settlement edge. I consider that such conditions are reasonable and necessary to ensure that the garage appears as an ancillary building that appropriately reflects its semi-rural location at the settlement edge.

9. Subject to the conditions outlined above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would accord with the design and locational objectives of LDP policies ENV1 and SP2, and would be consistent with the general thrust of Planning Policy Wales.

### **Other Matters**

10. My attention is drawn to other nearby buildings and developments in the area, but I consider these do not directly influence the individual context of the appeal site. I have therefore afforded these limited weight.
11. I have had regard to concerns raised in representations. I consider that the use and size of the building, and the size of the appeal site, are such that unacceptable impacts on drainage or highway safety would not arise. Whilst I have considered whether future conversion to residential use may be possible, the appellant has not sought a change of use and the description of development is clear and unambiguous. Matters regarding adherence to planning decisions are not before me. I have consequently attached limited weight to these matters and have proceeded to determine the appeal based on the merits of the case.
12. I have 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 WCFG Act). In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WCFG 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 in section 8 of the WCFG Act.

### **Conditions**

13. Other than the standard time limit and plans conditions, which are necessary in the interests of proper planning, for the reasons already given I have imposed conditions relating to external materials and landscaping.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Paul Selby*

INSPECTOR

## **SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No 12/01/2 (site plan); Drawing No 16.024.1 (plans and elevations).
- 3) Prior to the construction of the building hereby approved details and/or samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of landscaping. The scheme shall include indications of all existing trees (including spread and species) and hedgerows on the land, identify those to be retained and set out measures for their protection throughout the course of development.
- 5) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.