

## **Appeals**

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

<b>APPEAL NO.</b>	2022
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	P/24/323/FUL
<b>APPELLANT</b>	WALTERS ENVIRONMENTAL LIMITED
<b>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</b>	REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE COMPRISING 1 RETAIL UNIT AND 1 BEDROOM FLAT ON THE GROUND FLOOR AND 2 FLATS ABOVE: 145 COMMERCIAL ST, MAESTEG
<b>PROCEDURE</b>	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
<b>DECISION LEVEL</b>	DELEGATED OFFICER

**The application was refused for the following reasons:**

1. The development proposal, by reason of its type and siting, seeks to provide residential ground floor space within the commercial centre of Maesteg (primary shopping frontage) and would likely dilute the continuity of the primary shopping frontage, fail to stimulate passing trade and would adversely affect the vitality, viability and character of Maesteg Town Centre, contrary to Policies ENT7 and SP12 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan, 2024.
2. The proposed demolition of 145 Commercial Street, Maesteg as an existing historic building that makes a positive contribution to the Maesteg Town Conservation Area forming a distinctive part of a townscape group, and the subsequent redevelopment of the site, would not protect, conserve, promote nor enhance this historic environment and would adversely impact the character and appearance of the area and the adjoining listed building contrary to Policies SP3 and SP18 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan 2024, the placemaking principles of Planning Policy Wales, Edition 12, 2024, and guidance contained within Technical Advice Note 24 - The Historic Environment, May 2017.

---

<b>APPEAL NO.</b>	2023
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	P/24/285/CAC
<b>APPELLANT</b>	WALTERS ENVIRONMENTAL LIMITED
<b>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</b>	CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT TO DEMOLISH A VACANT BUILDING IN MAESTEG CONSERVATION AREA: 145 COMMERCIAL ST, MAESTEG
<b>PROCEDURE</b>	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
<b>DECISION LEVEL</b>	DELEGATED OFFICER

**The application was refused for the following reason:**

1. The demolition of 145 Commercial Street, Maesteg which makes a positive contribution to the Maesteg Town Conservation Area and forms a distinctive part of a townscape group, does not protect, conserve, promote nor enhance this historic environment and is therefore contrary to Policy SP18 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan 2024, the placemaking outcomes of Planning Policy Wales, Edition 12, 2024, and the guidance within Technical Advice Note 24 - The Historic Environment, May 2017.

---

<b>APPEAL NO.</b>	2026
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	P/24/536/FUL
<b>APPELLANT</b>	MRS H LEWIS
<b>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</b>	19 CLOS Y GOG BROADLANDS BRIDGEND
<b>PROCEDURE</b>	HOUSEHOLDER
<b>DECISION LEVEL</b>	DELEGATED OFFICER

**The application was refused for the following reason:**

1. The development, by reason of its siting, form and design, constitutes an alien, incongruous and overly prominent feature that has an unacceptable detrimental impact on the established character and appearance of the host property and the open plan nature of the wider street scene, as well as the general character of the 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 (Edition 12, February 2024). And Technical Advice Note 12 (Design).

---

<b>APPEAL NO.</b>	2030
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	P/25/78/FUL
<b>APPELLANT</b>	MR A MORGAN
<b>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</b>	FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION AND PORCH EXTENSION TO FRONT ELEVATION: 86 TREMAINS COURT BRIDGEND
<b>PROCEDURE</b>	HOUSEHOLDER
<b>DECISION LEVEL</b>	DELEGATED OFFICER

**The application was refused for the following reason:**

1. The proposed development, by reason of its size, scale and design, represents an excessive and overly prominent form of development that fails to respect the character and proportion of the host dwelling and adjoining dwellings, resulting in a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to Policy SP3 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024), Supplementary Planning Guidance 02 Householder Development (2008), and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024) and Technical Advice Note 12: Design (2016).
-

<b>APPEAL NO.</b>	2031
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	P/25/106/FUL
<b>APPELLANT</b>	MRS L OWEN
<b>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</b>	TIMBER FRAMED SUMMER HOUSE/GARDEN ROOM TO FRONT GARDEN AREA: 25 YSBRYD Y COED PENYFAI
<b>PROCEDURE</b>	HOUSEHOLDER
<b>DECISION LEVEL</b>	DELEGATED OFFICER

**The application was refused for the following reason:**

1. The proposed development, by reason of its siting and scale, represents an unsympathetic and overly prominent addition to the host property that is out of keeping with the wider street scene to the detriment of local visual amenities, contrary to Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2 – Householder Development and Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).

---

**The following appeal has been decided since my last report to Committee:**

<b>APPEAL NO.</b>	2025
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	P/24/312/FUL
<b>APPELLANT</b>	MRS L CARTWRIGHT
<b>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</b>	ADDING A NEW DETACHED GARAGE AND CONVERTING THE EXISTING INTERNAL GARAGE TO A LIVING SPACE: 3 BROOK VALE, PENCOED
<b>PROCEDURE</b>	HOUSEHOLDER
<b>DECISION LEVEL</b>	DELEGATED OFFICER
<b>DECISION</b>	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE DISMISSED.

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

---

**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 G Hall BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 01/07/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04126-C6M1T8

Site address: 3 Brook Vale, Pencoed, Bridgend CF35 6LS

---

- 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 Lisa Cartwright against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
  - The application Ref P/24/312/FUL, dated 29 May 2024, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2024.
  - The development proposed is Adding a new detached garage and converting the existing internal garage to a living space.
  - A site visit was made on 5 June 2025.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. In the interests of accuracy, I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice.

### Main Issues

3. These are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and on highway safety.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with an integral garage, situated within a modern residential estate characterised by similarly designed properties. Dwellings along Brook Vale are set back from the highway behind front gardens and driveways, creating a consistent building line and contributing to a spacious, open character.
5. The proposal seeks to construct a garage positioned forward of the main dwelling on a landscaped area that currently includes trees and soft landscaping. Located on a prominent bend in the road, the proposed garage would be clearly visible within the streetscene.

6. The existing planting along Brook Vale plays a key role in softening the built form and enhancing the visual quality of the area. The landscaped area where the garage is proposed makes a valuable contribution to the street's character. Its loss, and replacement with a substantial built structure, would cause clear visual harm by diminishing the verdant setting and undermining the estate's planned openness. I attach particular weight to the loss of trees. Although the Green Infrastructure Statement outlines some mitigation measures, these are limited in detail, and based on the evidence before me, I cannot conclude that they would adequately offset the harm caused by the proposal.
7. In addition, the proposed siting of the garage forward of the main dwelling would introduce a prominent and incongruous feature that would disrupt the established building line. This would harm the area's character by undermining the regular layout and relationship between buildings and the highway as it would appear intrusive in the streetscene. It would also erode the prevailing openness of front gardens in this part of Brook Vale.
8. Although there is an existing garage adjacent to the appeal site serving No. 2 Brook Vale, it is set within the general building line of adjoining properties and is not unduly prominent. Other garages observed nearby appear to have been integrated into the estate's original layout and are generally well-related to their plots. The area is not characterised by buildings positioned forward of dwellings or the established building line.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the design and sustainable placemaking objectives of Policy SP3 1), 2), a), and b) of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (LDP), the guidance set out in the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), and Section 3 of Planning Policy Wales.

#### *Highway safety*

10. I visited the appeal site mid-morning and observed Brook Vale to be a quiet residential street with little traffic and few pedestrians. Vehicles were moving slowly, visibility was good, and most cars were parked on private driveways, with limited on-street parking.
11. The Council raises concerns that the garage's siting would require vehicles to manoeuvre across the footway at an oblique angle. However, given the low traffic volumes, slow vehicle speeds, and limited on-street parking, I am not persuaded that this would pose an unacceptable risk to highway or pedestrian safety. Such manoeuvres would occur infrequently and at low speeds, with adequate visibility available for drivers and other road users.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to highway safety. It would accord with the sustainable placemaking objectives of LDP Policy SP3 2), and the Parking Standards SPG.

#### **Other Matters and Conclusion**

13. I have considered the potential benefits of the scheme, including the provision of off-road parking to reduce congestion and improve highway safety, and the provision of additional storage space for the appeal property. However, these benefits would not outweigh the significant harm the development would cause to the character and appearance of the area.
14. I have noted the appellant's offer to discuss potential amendments to the appeal scheme. However, the appeal process cannot be used to evolve a scheme, and an appeal must always be made in respect of the proposal and plans considered by the Council. Only in

limited circumstances, which do not apply in this case, may an amendment be accepted. I have also had regard to the appellant's concerns about delays in the Council's handling of the application, but this is not a matter that affects the planning merits of the case.

15. Whilst I have found the proposal to be acceptable in terms of its effects on highway safety, this is a neutral factor which would not outweigh the identified harm. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

16. 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.

*G Hall*

INSPECTOR