

APPEALS

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

CODE NO.	C/17/3180422 (1812)
ENF NO.	ENF/123/15/C
APPELLANT	MR A SMITH
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	UNAUTHORISED STORAGE OF RUBBLE LAND NORTH OF NEWMARKET WORKS, WYNDHAM STREET, OGMORE VALE
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	ENFORCEMENT NOTICE
DECISION	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE DISMISSED AND THE ENFORCEMENT NOTICE BE UPHELD SUBJECT TO CORRECTIONS AND VARIATIONS. A copy of the appeal decision is attached as APPENDIX A

CODE NO.	D/17/3190308 (1819)
APPLICATION NO.	P/17/652/FUL
APPELLANT	MR & MRS DAVIES
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	PART 2 STOREY, PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION & DEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING GARAGE INTO GARDEN ROOM 81 EWENNY ROAD, BRIDGEND
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 the appeal decision is attached as APPENDIX B

CODE NO.	D/17/3190447 (1820)
APPLICATION NO.	P/17/557/FUL
APPELLANT	MR VIV HUGHES

SUBJECT OF APPEAL RE-FURBISHMENT OF EXISTING DWELLING, NEW ENTRANCE PORCH, RAISE HEIGHT OF ROOF TO ACCOMMODATE LOFT CONVERSION/SECOND FLOOR, VEHICLE PARKING MAESGWYN HOUSE, 63 BLACKMILL ROAD, BRYNCETHIN

PROCEDURE HOUSEHOLDER

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 the 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 application reference number)

Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 06/11/17

gan Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI
Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru
Dyddiad: 07/02/18
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 06/11/17

by Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers
Date: 07/02/18
Appeal Ref: APP/F6915/C/17/3180422
Site address: Land north of Newmarket Works, Wyndham Street, Ogmere Vale, Bridgend, CF32 7EU
The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr Anthony Smith against an enforcement notice issued by Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The enforcement notice, numbered ENF/123/15/C, was issued on 9 June 2017.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, change of use of the said land by the use for external storage of materials.
- The requirements of the notice are to cease the use of the land for all external storage of materials, including but not limited to aggregates. Remove and keep removed all external materials, including but not limited to aggregates, from the land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is one month after the Notice takes effect.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice be corrected and varied by:
 - the deletion of the alleged breach of planning control (Section 3) in its entirety and its replacement with the following text: "*Without planning permission, the change of use of the land for the external storage of materials*";
 - the deletion of the requirements of the notice (in Section 5) in their entirety and their replacement with the following text: "*Cease the use of the land for the external storage of materials, including but not limited to aggregates*" and to "*Remove all external materials, including but not limited to aggregates, from the land*"; and
 - the deletion of the period for compliance (in Section 5) in its entirety and its replacement with the following text: "*Three months after this Notice takes effect*".
2. Subject to these corrections and variations the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld. Planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to an irregular shaped parcel of land located on the opposite side of the road to the former Newmarket Works in Ogmere Vale which currently incorporates a single storey building used as a Class B2 workshop. The appellant contends that the appeal site comprises part of the same planning unit as the former Newmarket Works. However, whilst the Council acknowledges that the parking of vehicles and the historic stationing of two storage containers on site are immune from enforcement action, it submits that the appeal site is an entirely separate planning unit from the former Newmarket Works. The evidence indicates that there have not been any implemented planning permissions or any certificates granted under sections 191 or 192 of the Act to corroborate the appellant's assertions.
4. The appellant acknowledges that the land has more recently been used for the external storage of building materials associated with his construction business. Despite not objecting to the historic stationing of the two storage containers or the parking of vehicles, the Council objects to the wider use of the appeal site for the external storage of materials and considers it expedient to take enforcement action.

The Enforcement Notice

5. The breach of planning control is described within the enforcement notice as: "*Without planning permission, change of use of the said land by the use for external storage of materials*". The corresponding requirements of the notice are to: "*Cease the use of the land for all external storage of materials, including but not limited to aggregates*" and to "*Remove and keep removed all external materials, including but not limited to aggregates, from the land*".
6. In the interest and clarity and precision, I consider it necessary to correct the allegation to state: "*Without planning permission, the change of use of the land for the external storage of materials*". For the same reason, I also consider it necessary to amend the corresponding requirements of the notice so that they read as follows: "*Cease the use of the land for the external storage of materials, including but not limited to aggregates*" and to "*Remove all external materials, including but not limited to aggregates, from the land*".
7. As such amendments merely add clarity to the notice, I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by such corrections.

The Ground (a) Appeal – The Deemed Planning Application

8. An appeal under section 174(2)(a) of the Act, hereinafter referred as the ground (a) appeal, is that planning permission should be granted for what is alleged within the notice. Under the terms of the corrected allegation, it would ordinarily follow that planning permission is sought for the change of use of the land for the external storage of materials. However, it is clear from the evidence supporting the appellant's case that he is only seeking planning permission to retain the use of the land for the external storage of materials for a temporary period of two years.
9. The main issues to be considered in the determination of the ground (a) appeal are: *whether the development is justified in the location proposed, having particular regard to the planning policy framework; the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area; and the effect of the proposed development upon the openness of the green wedge, including whether any identified harm would be clearly outweighed by very exceptional circumstances.*

10. The appeal site is located outside of the settlement boundaries defined by the adopted Bridgend County Borough Council Local Development Plan (2013) (LDP) and is therefore located within the countryside for the purposes of planning. Consistent with national planning policy, Policy ENV1 of the adopted LDP states that development within the countryside will be strictly controlled. Having considered the policy framework set both nationally and locally, including that set out in Technical Advice Note 6: *Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities* (2010) (TAN6), I am not aware of any policy provisions that render the appeal proposal exempt from such strict control. I recognise the appellant's assertion that the site comprises previously developed land. However, whilst Planning Policy Wales (Edition 9, 2016) (PPW) provides for a preference for the re-use of land, such a provision does not in my view override other policy considerations, including those intended to protect the countryside.
11. In terms of the protection of the countryside, I was able to confirm at the time of my site inspection that, despite the presence of other industrial uses within the vicinity, the wider character of the valley floor is generally undeveloped and rural. I was also able to confirm that the external storage of materials represents an untidy use that is visible from various vantage points within the immediate and wider vicinity. In this respect, despite only modest quantities of such materials being stored at the time of my site visit, it was clear that the alleged use serves to intensify the industrial appearance of the site and, thereby, cause material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Moreover, as I have not been provided with any planning conditions that would satisfactorily control the quantities of such external storage, there is a very real risk that such impacts could be exacerbated should planning permission be granted.
12. The land in question also falls within the '*Nantymoel and Ogmere Vale Green Wedge*' designation, as defined by Policy ENV2(14) of the adopted LDP. That policy states that development which causes, or contributes to the coalescence of settlements, or reduces the openness of land between settlements will not be permitted. Broadly consistent with this approach, Section 4.8 of PPW states that general policies controlling development within the countryside apply in green wedges, but that in such areas there is an additional presumption against development that is inappropriate in relation to the purposes of the green wedge designation. It goes on to state that LPAs should attach substantial weight to any harmful impact which a development would have on a green wedge and that inappropriate development should not be granted planning permission except in very exceptional circumstances where other material considerations clearly outweigh the harm which such development would do to the green wedge.
13. There is no doubt in my mind that the external storage of materials comprises inappropriate development for the purposes of implementing green wedge policy. Moreover, as the external storage of materials intensifies the visual clutter and industrial appearance of the site, it clearly serves to erode the openness of the Green Wedge and, in doing so, conflicts with the purpose of including the land within it. As prescribed by national policy, the loss of openness carries with it substantial weight in the planning balance and should be avoided except in very exceptional circumstances. Within this context, and having had full regard to the appellant's case, it is important to note that I have not seen anything in terms of cogent evidence to indicate that very exceptional circumstances exist to outweigh the identified harm.
14. Based on the foregoing analysis, I have found that the use of land for the external storage of materials has not been justified in its countryside location. I have also found that it causes material harm to the character and appearance of the area and that it fails to maintain the openness of the Green Wedge. The development has also

not been justified by the presence of any very exceptional circumstances that clearly outweigh the identified harm. On this basis, I find that the use of the land conflicts with the provisions of Policy ENV1 and ENV2 of the adopted LDP and, for the same reasons, I also find that it conflicts with the planning policy framework set nationally.

15. I have considered the Council's reference to Policy ENV9: *Development in Mineral Safeguarding Areas* of the adopted LDP. However, I have not seen anything to indicate that the external storage of materials would represent a sterilising use and have not, therefore, afforded weight to such matters. Meanwhile, I do not consider matters relating to highway safety or residential amenity to comprise insurmountable constraints. I have fully considered the fact that the appellant only seeks a temporary planning permission for a period of two years. However, given the extent of the conflict with the aforementioned planning policy framework and the extent of the harm identified, I do not consider a temporary planning permission of any length of time to be justified. Indeed, I consider the aforementioned concerns to amount to compelling reasons why planning permission should not be granted.
16. For these reasons, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal under ground (a) should fail.

The Ground (g) Appeal

17. An appeal under ground (g) is that the time given to comply with the requirements of the enforcement notice is too short. In this case, the period of compliance is one month after the notice takes effect and the appellant contends that a phased period of compliance would be more appropriate. Specifically, the appellant contends that the first stage of compliance should be to cease the use of the land within a period of 3 months and that a second period of 6 months should be set aside for the appellant to utilise the materials on site and find an alternative location for such storage having regard to the need to secure appropriate permissions.
18. Having regard to the potential disruption to the appellant's business, I consider that a period of time in excess of one month is justified. However, I am also mindful of the fact that extending the period of compliance would prolong the identified harm and that a period of 6 months would be tantamount to a temporary planning permission which I have already dismissed as being unjustified. On this basis, I consider that a period of 3 months for the appellant to comply with the corrected requirements would strike an appropriate balance between the need to minimise the identified harm and the need to minimise disruption to the appellant's business.
19. To this limited extent, the appeal under ground (g) succeeds. I shall vary the terms of the enforcement notice accordingly.

Overall Conclusions

20. Based on the foregoing, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and that the enforcement notice should be upheld subject to corrections and variations. Planning permission should therefore be refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.
21. In coming to this conclusion, I have considered where relevant 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 (WBFG Act). I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and 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, as required by section 8 of the WBFG Act.

Richard E. Jenkins

INSPECTOR

Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 11/01/18

gan **Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 31/01/18

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11/01/18

by **Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 31/01/18

Appeal Ref: APP/F6915/D/17/3190308

Site address: 81 Ewenny Road, Bridgend, CF31 3LD

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 and Mrs Davies against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The application Ref: P/17/652/FUL, dated 26 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2017.
- The development is proposed (part two storey, part single storey) rear extension and development of existing garage into garden room.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed (part two storey, part single storey) rear extension and development of existing garage into garden room at 81 Ewenny Road, Bridgend, CF31 3LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: P/17/652/FUL, dated 26 July 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule below.

Procedural Matters

2. During the processing of the planning application, revised plans were submitted. The Council determined the application based on the amended plans and I have considered the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issues

3. These are the effect of the proposed development upon: the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties and the surrounding area; and the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular reference to privacy.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a typical semi-detached property located in a predominantly residential area of Bridgend. The appeal proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a part two storey part single storey rear extension and a front porch. It also seeks permission to convert the existing detached garage to a garden room. The proposed porch and conversion of the garage are not disputed by the Council and do not form part of the reason for refusal. Neither does the Council object to the

proposed ground floor extension. I shall therefore confine my reasoning to the effect of the proposed first floor rear extension.

Character and Appearance

5. The Council objects to the proposed first floor extension on the basis that it would represent an excessive, incongruous and overly prominent form of development that would have a detrimental impact on the traditional character of the host property and surrounding area. Specifically, the Council objects to the design, size, siting, use of materials and external finish of the proposed extension.
6. There is no doubt that the contemporary style and use of materials on the proposed extension would contrast with the traditional design of the host property and neighbouring dwellings. Indeed, the box like proportions would differ from the traditional pitched roof elements of the host and adjoining property, as would the use of zinc cladding and powder coated anthracite grey aluminium window frames. Nevertheless, rather than undermine the character of the existing property, I agree with the appellant's assertion that the use of materials and overall design would add visual interest to the property and serve to successfully differentiate the traditional two storey element from the contemporary extension.
7. I recognise the fact that the extension would be visible from the rear amenity areas of neighbouring properties and from the public highway at Priory Road. However, based on the foregoing analysis, and bearing in mind the modest height of the flat roof structure, I do not consider that it would be overly prominent or harmful to the immediate or wider environs. Indeed, by virtue of its height and depth, I am satisfied that it would retain subservience to the host property and, by reason of the juxtaposition of the contemporary and traditional elements, would enhance the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties or the surrounding area. As such, I find no conflict with the general thrust of Policy SP2 of the adopted Bridgend County Borough Council Local Development Plan (2013)(LDP) which generally seeks to ensure that all development should contribute towards the aim of creating high quality, attractive and sustainable places which enhance the community in which they are located whilst having full regard to the natural, historic and built environment.
9. I note the conflict with paragraph 6.4.3 of Note 11 of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 02 entitled *Householder Development* (2008). However, such advice represents guidance only and should not therefore be treated as determinative. As such, and bearing in mind the fact that I have already concluded that the proposal is policy compliant, I do not consider that such conflict represents a justifiable reason for withholding planning permission. Moreover, given my conclusions above, I do not find any conflict with Note 12 or Note 16 of the same SPG document, not least because the latter relates specifically to side extensions.

Living Conditions

10. The Council objects to the proposed development on the basis that the proposed first floor extension would have a detrimental impact on the level of privacy experienced by the occupier of No.83 Ewenny Road. However, the appellants have clarified in their appeal statement that the only first floor window providing direct views into the garden area of No.83 is proposed to be obscure glazed and I am satisfied that such

matters could be satisfactorily controlled via the imposition of a suitably worded planning condition.

11. I have considered the other matters raised by interested parties. However, by virtue of the scale, siting and flat roof design of the proposed development, I agree with the Council's assessment that the development would not result in unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impacts upon neighbouring properties.
12. For these reasons I conclude that, subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development would not cause material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. As such, I find no conflict with Policy SP2 of the adopted LDP which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring uses and their occupiers would not be adversely affected. For the same reasons, I also find no conflict with Note 6 of the aforementioned SPG or the planning policy framework set nationally.

Other Matters

13. A number of other matters have been raised, including those relating to boundary disputes. However, such matters largely comprise civil matters that could be addressed outside of planning processes and do not therefore justify the refusal of planning permission. The evidence does not indicate that there would be any long term increase in noise at No.79 as a result of the proposed development, although I shall impose a planning condition restricting construction hours given the proximity of the proposed extension to habitable rooms at No.79. Finally, given that building regulations are covered by separate legislation, I do not consider it necessary to consider matters pertaining to such legislation in this decision.

Overall Conclusions

14. Based on the foregoing, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.
15. In coming to this conclusion, 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 (WBFG Act). I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and 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, as required by section 8 of the WBFG Act.
16. The Council has suggested a number of planning conditions, although I have amended the suggested wording of such conditions to reflect the advice contained within Welsh Government Circular 16/2014: *The Use of Planning Conditions for Development Management* (October 2014). In addition to the statutory time commencement condition, I have imposed a condition requiring details of external materials to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA in the interest of visual amenity. Given the clear contrast between the proposed extension and the existing property I consider this to be a more appropriate requirement than that suggested by the LPA. I have also imposed a condition requiring the side window of the first floor extension to be obscure glazed to address those matters set out above. Given the concerns raised regarding the disposal of surface water, I have imposed a condition requiring a drainage scheme to be implemented as approved. As this matter has been raised in written evidence, I am satisfied that nobody is prejudiced by the imposition of this

- condition. Finally, I have imposed a condition restricting the hours of construction to safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Richard E. Jenkins

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Prior to the construction of the extension hereby approved, full details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) Before the development hereby permitted is brought into use, the window located in the side elevation of the first floor rear extension shall be fitted with obscured glazing, details of which shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any part of the window that is less than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be non-opening. The window shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.
- 4) No development shall commence until details of a scheme for the disposal of surface water has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the beneficial use of the development and shall be thereafter retained in perpetuity.
- 5) Demolition or construction works shall not take place outside the hours of 09.00 hours to 18.00 Mondays to Fridays and 09.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 01/02/18

gan **Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 26/02/18

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 01/02/18

by **Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 26/02/18

Appeal Ref: APP/F6915/D/17/3190447

Site address: Maesgwyn House, 63 Blackmill Road, Bryncethin, Bridgend, CF32 9YN

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 Viv Hughes against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17/557/FUL, dated 29 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2017.
 - The development proposed is refurbishment of existing dwelling, new entrance porch, raise height of roof to accommodate loft conversion/ second floor, vehicle parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Notice of Decision as it provides a more concise and accurate description than that outlined on the original planning application form. As the amended description is consistent with that outlined on the Appeal Form, I am satisfied that there would be no prejudice in this respect.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached two storey property set back a significant distance from Blackmill Road. The building is not listed and neither is it located within a conservation area. Nevertheless, the property represents an attractive traditional and well-proportioned dwelling that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 5. The appeal proposal seeks full planning permission to undertake general refurbishments to the property and to increase the roof height of the dwelling to accommodate a second floor extension. The form of the roof would be altered from one that is broadly symmetrical incorporating a 30 degree pitch to one that would be asymmetrical with a 40 degree pitch. The rear elevation of the property would be
-

significantly altered by the construction of substantial glazed dormers that would overhang the resulting eaves. That same elevation would also incorporate significant changes in terms of its fenestration detailing, with original openings replaced by new windows.

6. By virtue of their modest scale and sensitive design, I do not consider that the proposed alterations to the front elevation of the property would cause material harm to the traditional character of the property. The change to the pitch of the roof could also be incorporated into an acceptable scheme. However, there is no doubt in my mind that the substantial dormer additions would, by virtue of their scale and overall design, represent overly dominant features that would jar with the modest simplicity of the traditional and well-proportioned design of the existing dwelling. Such harm would also be exacerbated by the proposed replacement of the traditional window openings, particularly the loss of the arched first floor window serving the landing which I consider to enhance the traditional character of the property.
7. I recognise the fact that more contemporary dwellings are proposed to be located within the immediate vicinity of the property. I also have no doubt that the substantially glazed dormer windows would provide attractive views of the surrounding countryside. However, I do not consider such matters to justify the harm identified, not least because the rear elevation of the property comprises an important aspect that is clearly visible upon the approach to the property.
8. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Accordingly, I find that the development would run counter to the general thrust of Policy SP2 of the adopted Bridgend County Borough Council Local Development Plan (2013)(LDP) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled Note 02: *Householder Development*. Therefore, having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
9. In coming to this conclusion, 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 (WBFG Act). I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and 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, as required by section 8 of the WBFG Act.

Richard E. Jenkins

INSPECTOR