

Appeals

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

APPEAL NO.	2025
APPLICATION NO	P/24/312/FUL
APPELLANT	MRS L CARTWRIGHT
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	ADDING A NEW DETACHED GARAGE AND CONVERTING THE EXISTING INTERNAL GARAGE TO A LIVING SPACE: 3 BROOK VALE
PROCEDURE	HOUSEHOLDER
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed garage, by reason of its siting, scale and design, represents an incongruous and overly prominent form of development, projecting forward of the established building line in the street that would have a detrimental impact on the established character and appearance of the streetscene in this residential area, contrary to Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2024), Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02: Householder Development (2008) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).
2. The proposed garage, by reason of its siting and orientation, would result in a substandard arrangement to the detriment of pedestrian and highway safety, contrary to the requirements of Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within SPG17: Parking Standards (2011).

APPEAL NO.	2027
APPLICATION NO	ENF/234/22/ACK
APPELLANT	ME GROUP INTERNATIONAL PLC
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	ALLEGED UNAUTHORISED SITING OF OUTSIDE LAUNDRY MACHINES: ADJ. ONE TY TALBOT ELM CRESCENT BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPS
DECISION LEVEL	ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

APPEAL NO.	2028
APPLICATION NO	P/22/713/FUL
APPELLANT	ME GROUP INTERNATIONAL PLC
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	RETENTION OF MODULAR SELF-SERVICE LAUNDERETTE FACILITY & ASSOCIATED WORKS: ADJ. ONE STOP STORE TY TALBOT ELM CRESCENT BRIDGEND

PROCEDURE

WRITTEN REPS

DECISION LEVEL

DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The design and operation of this modular self-service launderette facility is considered to be inappropriate for this predominantly residential location. The proposal is out of keeping with the locality and it is a discordant and visually obtrusive structure. Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that noise and odours from the operation of the launderette facility will not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the nearest residents. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SP3 and DNP9 of the Replacement Bridgend Local Development Plan 2024 the Strategic Placemaking Principles of Future Wales: The National Development Plan 2040 as well as advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12.
2. The proposed development does not accord with Policies SP3, SP5 and PLA11 of the adopted Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan 2024; the Strategic Placemaking Principles of Future Wales: The National Development Plan 2040 as well as advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 for the following reasons:
 - In the absence of adequate off-street parking facilities, the development would generate additional on street parking to the detriment of highway safety.
 - The proposed development will create traffic hazards in the form of pavement parking and on-street parking to the detriment of the safety and free flow of traffic on Elm Crescent.
 - The proposed development will generate additional on-street parking on a bend where forward visibility is restricted due to the alignment of the highway.

APPEAL NO. 2029

APPLICATION NO P/24/424/FUL

APPELLANT MR C BOWEN

SUBJECT OF APPEAL SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT OF DWELLING: 123
HEOL Y BARDD BRIDGEND

PROCEDURE HOUSEHOLDER

DECISION LEVEL DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its design, siting and scale, would result in a development that would appear visually obtrusive and out of keeping in the street scene, failing to reflect the consistent and established character of the immediate area to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2 – Householder Development.
-

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

APPEAL NO.	2015
APPLICATION NO	P24/10/FUL
APPELLANT	MRS C LEWIS
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	REPLACE BOUNDARY WALL WITH ONE OF INCREASED HEIGHT; RETENTION OF WOODEN PLAYROOM: 5 BELMONT CLOSE MAESTEG
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER
DECISION	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE PART ALLOWED/PART DISMISSED

The joint Appeal decision for these two decisions is attached as **APPENDIX A.**

APPEAL NO.	2019
APPLICATION NO	P/23/647/FUL
APPELLANT	MR T CADOGAN
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF GARAGE AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE A FAMILY ROOM AND UTILITY TO THE GROUND FLOOR AND 2NO. BEDROOMS TO THE FIRST FLOOR, CREATE 1NO. ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACE TO FRONT AND EXTEND DROPPED KERB: 98 YR YSFA MAESTEG
PROCEDURE	HOUSEHOLDER
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER
DECISION	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE DISMISSED.

The Appeal decision is attached as **APPENDIX B.**

RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the Corporate Director Communities be noted.

JANINE NIGHTINGALE
CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES

Background Papers (see application reference number)



Appeal Decision

by H Davies BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 15/04/2025

Appeal references: CAS-03634-R5M5W0 & CAS-03635-V5B7Y3

Site address: 5 Belmont Close, Maesteg, CF34 0LH

Appeal A reference: CAS-03634-R5M5W0

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Christina Lewis and Mr Christian Lewis against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application reference P/24/10/FUL was refused by notice dated 11 June 2024.
 - The development proposed is 'Replace boundary wall with one of increased height; retention of wooden playroom'.
 - A site visit was made on 9 April 2025.
-

Appeal B reference: CAS-03635-V5B7Y3

- 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 Act).
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Christina Lewis and Mr Christian Lewis against an enforcement notice issued by Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The enforcement notice reference ENF/241/23/ACK was issued on 4 January 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission (i) the replacement of a boundary wall with a wall of increased height and (ii) the erection of a wooden outbuilding used as a playroom and erected within the side garden area of the dwelling house, both (i) and (ii) being situated adjacent to the highway.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 - (i) Remove and keep removed the wooden playroom entirely from the Land and dwelling house known as 5 Belmont Close, Maesteg, Bridgend CF34 0LD;
 - (ii) Reduce the height of the boundary wall to a maximum of 1m in height; AND
 - (iii) Remove all resultant materials including base materials from the Land resulting from steps (i) and (ii) above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Act.
 - A site visit was made on 9 April 2025.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the wall with pillars and infill panels and planning permission is refused for 'replacement of boundary wall with one of increased height'.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the outbuilding (wooden playroom), and planning permission is granted for the 'wooden playroom' at 5 Belmont Close, Maesteg, CF34 0LH, in accordance with the terms of the application, reference P/24/10/FUL, dated 28 February 2024, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, dated February 2024, reference WD/01, WD/02 and WD/03.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans submitted with the application.

- 2) Within 2 months of the date of this decision an artificial nesting site for birds shall be erected at the site to one of the following specifications and retained for as long as the development hereby approved remains in existence: Nest box specification for house sparrow terrace - Wooden (or woodcrete) nest box with 3 sub-divisions to support 3 nesting pairs, to be placed under the eaves of the building. Entrance holes of 32mm diameter. Dimensions of H310 c W370 x D185mm; OR Swift nest box specification – Wide box with small slit shaped entrance hole to be placed under or close to roof. Dimensions of H150 x W340 x S150mm.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity, in accordance with Future Wales Policy 9 and Policy DNP6 of the Bridgend County Borough Local Development Plan (2018-2033).

Decision – Appeal B

3. The appeal on ground (a) is dismissed insofar as it relates to the wall, and the enforcement notice is upheld. Planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under s177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the development already carried out, namely the replacement of a boundary wall with a wall of increased height, at 5 Belmont Close, Maesteg, CF34 0LH.
4. The appeal on ground (a) is allowed, insofar as it relates to the outbuilding and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the development already carried out, namely the erection of a wooden outbuilding used as a playroom and erected within the side garden area of the dwelling house at 5 Belmont Close, Maesteg, CF34 0LH, subject to the following condition:

- 1) Within 2 months of the date of this decision an artificial nesting site for birds shall be erected at the site to one of the following specifications and retained for as long as the development hereby approved remains in existence: Nest box specification for house sparrow terrace - Wooden (or woodcrete) nest box with 3 sub-divisions to support 3 nesting pairs, to be placed under the eaves of the building. Entrance holes of 32mm diameter. Dimensions of H310 c W370 x D185mm; OR Swift nest box specification – Wide box with small slit shaped entrance hole to be placed under or close to roof. Dimensions of H150 x W340 x S150mm.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity, in accordance with Future Wales Policy 9 and Policy DNP6 of the Bridgend County Borough Local Development Plan (2018-2033).

Background and Preliminary Matters

5. As set out above, there are two appeals at the appeal site. I shall consider each case on its own particular merits, but to avoid duplication, I shall deal with both in this single document, albeit with separate formal decisions. For the avoidance of any doubt, Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission and Appeal B relates to the notice.
6. Appeal A seeks planning permission to replace the boundary wall with one of increased height, with pillars and infill panels. It also seeks to retain a 'wooden playroom' (henceforth referred to as the outbuilding), including cladding the external surfaces. Any permission granted on Appeal A would relate to the development as set out in the submitted plans.
7. Appeal B has been made on ground (a) only which is that in respect of any breach of planning control which may be constituted by the matters stated in the notice, planning permission ought to be granted. The terms of the deemed planning application for ground (a) are derived from the allegation set out in the notice. Hence, planning permission is sought for replacement of a boundary wall with a wall of increased height and the erection of a wooden outbuilding used as a playroom. Any permission granted on ground (a) of Appeal B would relate to the situation at the time the notice was served. Photographs submitted by the Council show that the outbuilding was largely complete, but the cladding was unfinished, while the blockwork for the wall and pillars was complete, but the infill panels had not been added.
8. The outbuilding and wall are separate elements that are physically and functionally distinct. I have the power to issue a split decision, so as the two elements have different effects, where appropriate I have considered them separately.

Appeal A (the s78 planning application appeal)

Main Issues

9. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - The character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area;
 - The safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles using the highway along Belmont Close; and
 - The living conditions of occupants of the dwelling regarding outside amenity space.

Reasons – Character and Appearance

10. Belmont Close consists of 5 pairs of semi-detached dwellings arranged along only one side of the road, with a tight bend in the middle, on which the appeal site is located. The dwellings are set back from the road with front boundaries consisting of walls no more than around a metre in height, some of which have modest height bushes behind them. The side of the road without houses features a wide grass verge. Taken together the above factors give Belmont Close an open and spacious character.

The wall with pillars and infill panels

11. Due to its corner location, the appeal site has a much longer boundary with the road than other dwellings in the area. The proposed plans show a blockwork wall to a height of 0.75 metres, with regularly spaced blockwork pillars, infilled by panelling, to a height of 1.45 metres. The proposed height of the wall with pillars and infill panels would exceed that of the surrounding dwellings. When combined with the length it would be a solid and overly prominent form of development at odds with its surroundings and detrimental to the established openness and spaciousness of the area.

The outbuilding

12. The front elevation of No 5 follows a consistent building line with Nos 6 to 8 Belmont Close. Due to its location, the outbuilding does not impact on this consistency. Due to the angle of the bend, neither the side nor rear elevation of No 5 follows the building line of Nos 1 to 4 Belmont Close, with the corner creating a strong visual break. No 5 previously had a detached garage located to the side and partly to the rear of the dwelling. This has been replaced with an attached garage to the side and there is also a rear extension. Consequently, prior to the appeal development, the rear and side of No 5 was already different to and visually distinct from the street scene from No 1 to 4.
13. The outbuilding has different proportions to the now removed detached garage, but the footprint is not significantly different. While the outbuilding is located closer to the boundary with both No 4 and the road, the removed garage also projected forward of the building line created by the front of Nos 1 to 4 and was set away from the side elevation of the appeal dwelling.
14. A wall or fence up to 2 meters in height could be constructed along the boundary between the appeal site and No 4 (ie not adjacent to the road), under permitted development rights. Due to the layout and configuration of the site in relation to its neighbours, any such wall or fence would be a prominent structure when looking along the road from No 1 to 4 and the outbuilding would not be significantly higher.
15. On balance, although highly visible from the road, due to the factors above and when compared to the situation prior to the proposed development, the outbuilding is of an acceptable size and location and does not have a detrimental impact on the established character and appearance of the site and its surroundings.

Conclusion on character and appearance

16. I conclude that the wall with pillars and infill panels would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area and would not comply with Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan 2018-2033 (LDP), or the advice set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG 02: Householder Development.
17. However, I conclude that the outbuilding does not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. As such, the development complies with Policy SP3 of the LDP and is broadly in line with advice in SPG02. Amongst other things, Policy SP3 seeks to ensure that development is of a scale, form, layout and materials which are appropriate to its context.

Reasons – Highway safety

18. Belmont Close is accessed via a turning off Brodawl and is relatively narrow, with a wide grass verge on the opposite side to the houses. The other end of Belmont Close is closed and it is a quiet residential street subject to low traffic movement. The vehicle access onto the appeal site is located directly on the bend.

The wall

19. The proposed wall with pillars and infill panels, to a height of 1.45 metres, right up to the vehicle access, located on a sharp bend, would inevitably obscure visibility for and of any vehicle entering or leaving the site. Despite the quiet nature of the road, this would result in safety issues for all users of the highway.
20. This could potentially be alleviated by reducing the height of the wall near the vehicle access to create suitable visibility splays. However, as I have found the proposed wall with pillars and infill panels on such a long and prominent boundary to be unacceptable in terms of character and appearance, I have not considered this further.

The outbuilding

21. The outbuilding is set away from the bend and the vehicle access onto the site, so would not unreasonably impact on visibility. Given this and the quiet and lightly trafficked nature of the road, the outbuilding does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Conclusion on highway safety

22. I conclude that the wall with pillars and infill panels would cause unacceptable harm to the safety of pedestrians, cyclists or vehicles using the highway along Belmont Close. However, I conclude that the outbuilding does not cause harm to highway safety. As such, with regard to the outbuilding I find no conflict with LDP Policy SP3 or the advice set out in SPG02.

Reasons – Outside amenity space

23. Due to the location and layout of the appeal site, combined with extensions to the original building, there is limited outside space to the rear of the dwelling, but there is ample space to the side and to the front. The dwellings at No 4 and No 6 have similarly small areas of outside space to the rear. Overall, the provision of outside amenity space at the appeal site is acceptable for the size of the dwelling and is in keeping with the area.
24. I conclude that the development provides acceptable living conditions for the occupants regarding outside amenity space and so complies with Policy SP3 of the LDP.

Other Matters

25. I note the appellants' reasons for wanting a higher boundary wall, particularly as most dwellings have a relatively private and secure area of garden to the rear. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified to character and appearance and highway safety. The appellant could explore other options to achieve similar objectives, such as planting around the boundary, or seeking planning permission, as necessary, for a smaller private and secure outside area to the rear and part of the side of the dwelling.
26. The impact of the development on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties is raised in passing by a third party. The Council did not refuse the application on this basis and on the information provided, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion. Any claimed impact on surrounding property values is unsubstantiated and not for consideration under this appeal.

Conditions

27. In the event that I am minded to allow the appeal and grant planning permission, the Council has suggested conditions be imposed. I have considered the need for conditions in light of the advice in Welsh Government Circular 016/2014 "The Use of Planning Conditions for Development Management".
28. For certainty on the development which has been permitted, it is necessary to specify the approved plans. Policy 9 of Future Wales requires all development to secure a net benefit in biodiversity. This is reflected in Policy SP3 of the LDP. The Council has suggested a condition which details the provision of a nest box. Given the scale and nature of the development I consider a nestbox to be suitable. However, as the development has already commenced, I have adjusted the suggested condition to require implementation with 2 months. This is reasonable and necessary to accord with policy.
29. The Council also suggested conditions with regard to vision splays. As set out above, I do not consider highway safety to be an issue with regard to the outbuilding and permission will not be granted for the wall with pillars and infill panels. Consequently, it is not necessary to impose conditions relating to vision splays.

Conclusion

30. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part, as set out in the formal decision.
31. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives, as required by section 8 of the Act.

Appeal B on ground (a) (the s174 enforcement notice appeal)

Main Issues and Reasons

32. The main issues and reasons are the same as for Appeal A. As set out under Appeal A, I find the outbuilding to be acceptable, including the proposed finishing in cladding. Other than the incomplete cladding, the outbuilding subject to the deemed application under Appeal B is the same as for Appeal A, so there is no need for me to consider it further.
33. Under Appeal A I find the wall with pillars and infill panels to be unacceptable. The deemed application under Appeal B covers the wall and pillars, but not the infill panels. The impact of the wall with pillars on the open character of the area and on highway safety is less without the infill panels. Notwithstanding this, the pillars are still an incongruous element and potentially more prominent and jarring without the panels. The pillars, particularly those closest to the site access, would block visibility to an extent and hence would still result in highway safety issues. As such, I consider the wall with pillars, as covered by the notice and the deemed application, to be unacceptable and in conflict with Policy SP3 of the LDP.

Conditions

34. The need to impose conditions has been considered under Appeal A and also applies to Appeal B. However, as any permission granted under the Appeal B deemed application is retrospective, it is not necessary to impose a plans condition.

Conclusion

35. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the outbuilding is acceptable but the wall with pillars is not. Therefore, I shall dismiss the ground (a) appeal, uphold the notice, and refuse planning permission in so far as it relates to the wall and pillars, but allow the ground (a) appeal and grant planning permission in so far as it relates to the outbuilding, as set out in the formal decision.
36. S180(1) of the Act provides that where, after the service of an enforcement notice, planning permission is granted for any development carried out before the grant of that permission, the notice shall cease to have effect so far as it is inconsistent with that permission. To avoid the potential for the creation of inconsistent permissions I will not vary the notice to omit the requirement to remove the outbuilding but will rely on s180 of the Act. Thus, the notice will be upheld but will cease to have effect with regard to the outbuilding.

H Davies

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

by C Sweet MPlan

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 13/03/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-03804-N2G5P5

Site address: 98 Yr Ysfa, Maesteg, Bridgend, CF34 9BE

- 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 Thomas Cadogan against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/23/647/FUL, dated 10 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as 'partial demolition of garage and construction of two story rear extension to provide a family room and utility to the ground floor and 2no. bedrooms to the first floor; create 1no. additional parking space to front and extend dropped kerb'.
 - A site visit was made on 5 March 2025.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There is some difference between the descriptions of development used on the application form, the appeal form and the Council's decision notice. I have used the latter, as it most accurately reflects the development proposed.
3. I note the appellant's preference for the scheme originally submitted to the Council. However, the Council's decision was based on amended plans provided during the application process. Those amended plans are therefore the subject of this appeal and I have determined it on that basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of occupiers of 96 Yr Ysfa, with regard to visual impact and sunlight and daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The proposed parking space and extension to the existing dropped kerb do not appear to be of any concern to the Council and having regard to their proposed scale and siting, I have no reason to conclude otherwise. I am therefore satisfied that these elements of the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house with a detached garage. Although there are a small number of exceptions, houses along the western side of Yr Ysfa close to the appeal property largely share a consistency of scale and a simple, repetitive built form consisting of symmetrical pairs of semi-detached houses separated by considerable gaps at first floor level.
7. Notwithstanding the variety of built form and domestic extensions found in the wider area, this gives the street scene at this point a pleasing, rhythmic appearance which contributes positively to the character of the area.
8. Although visibility of the proposed extension would be limited from the wooded area to the rear of the appeal property, due to its positioning and 'wrap around' element that would project forward of the rear building line, it would be clearly visible from the street along Yr Ysfa.
9. Due to its height, width and projection to the side of the appeal property, the proposed extension would significantly reduce the visual separation between the appeal property and its southern neighbour at first floor level, interrupting the rhythmic appearance of the street scene at this point.
10. Moreover, the resulting asymmetry between the appeal property and No 96 would appear as an awkward and prominent feature in the immediate street scene which would draw the eye of the observer. In combination, these factors would cause the appeal property to appear incongruous when viewed in context with the prevailing built form along the western side of Yr Ysfa and result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. I therefore find that the proposed extension conflicts with policy SP3 of the Bridgend County Borough Local Development Plan 2018-2033 (the LDP) which, among other things, requires that development should be appropriate to its local context in terms of size, scale and height.

Living Conditions

12. Notwithstanding a partial set back at first floor level, due to its height, proximity to and projection along the shared boundary, the proposed extension would appear visually intrusive and overbearing when viewed from the rear garden and rear ground floor windows serving a habitable room at No 96.
13. This would significantly reduce the enjoyment of those spaces for occupiers of No 96 and result in unacceptable harm to their living conditions, contrary to policy SP3 of the LDP which, among other things, requires that development ensures that the amenity of neighbouring uses and their occupiers will not be adversely affected.
14. I have considered the examples of other extensions drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, I note that those examples were permitted under a previous policy framework. I have considered the scheme before me on its merits against the most up to date development plan policy and have found it unacceptable for the reasons set out above.
15. Due to its height and depth and the orientation of the houses at this point, the proposed extension would slightly reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the rear ground floor windows at No 96 for part of the day. However, due to the degree of set back from the shared boundary at first floor level and the pitch of its roof, such effects would be limited. The proposal would also result in little appreciable change in the overall level of daylight reaching those windows and as such, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of occupiers of No 96 in this respect.

Other Matters

16. The appellant suggests that there is a shortage of affordable, suitably sized homes in the local area to meet their needs, but I have not been provided with any cogent evidence to support this argument.
17. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to remain at the appeal property and the personal circumstances and nature of their employment which underpin their need for additional living and work space. I accept that the proposal would offer some benefits to the appellant in these respects. However, on the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that such needs could not be met by other, less harmful alternatives. I therefore find that withholding planning permission is both proportionate and necessary.
18. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of their application, but such issues are not before me in this appeal and as such, I make no comment on them.
19. The proposal would provide a proportionate degree of biodiversity enhancement in the form of bird boxes and additional planting. However, such benefits would be slight and would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conditions

20. The Council has suggested a number of conditions intended to control various aspects of the proposal. However, the nature of the harms I have identified are such that the proposal could not be made acceptable by the imposition of conditions in any event.

Conclusion

21. I have found the proposed parking space and extension to the existing dropped kerb acceptable. I have also found the proposed extension acceptable with regard to sunlight and daylight.
22. However, the harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of occupiers of No 96 with regard to visual impact arising from the proposed extension would be significant, such that I find them to be overriding considerations in this case. I have had regard to the other matters raised, but none alters my conclusions. For the foregoing reasons, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
23. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives.

C Sweet

INSPECTOR