

Appeals

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

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| APPEAL NO. | 2033 |
| APPLICATION NO | P/24/92/FUL |
| APPELLANT | S & B THOMAS |
| SUBJECT OF APPEAL | INCLUSION OF LAND INTO CURTILAGE WITH RETAINING WALLS AND TERRACE (RETROSPECTIVE): HEDDFAN FEDERATION LANE PONTYCYMMER |
| PROCEDURE | WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS |
| DECISION LEVEL | DELEGATED OFFICER |

The application was approved with conditions of which the appellant is appealing condition 2 which stated:

Notwithstanding condition 1, within 3 months of the date of this approval, the existing boundary enclosures around the lower terraced area shall be removed and replaced with new 1.8m high metal hoop top panel fencing, to be finished in black. Temporary plastic leaf trellis screening can be affixed to the inside of this fence to protect the privacy of occupiers. The temporary plastic leaf trellis can remain in place and shall be removed once the privet hedging established on the inside of the fence reaches a height of 1.8m.

Reason To safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2018-2033).

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| APPEAL NO. | 2038 |
| APPLICATION NO | P/24/1/OUT |
| APPELLANT | MR P EVANS |
| SUBJECT OF APPEAL | OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ONE BLOCK OF 2 BEDROOM APARTMENTS (WITH APPROVAL FOR ACCESS) AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT WORKS: PARCEL A LAND NORTH OF UNDERHILL COTTAGES TONDU ROAD BRIDGEND |
| PROCEDURE | WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS |
| DECISION LEVEL | DELEGATED OFFICER |

The application was refused for the following reasons:

-
1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting and design, would constitute an undesirable intrusion of built development into an area of considerable landscape value to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area and constitute an inappropriate overdevelopment of the site with the plot being too restricted to accommodate the number of residential units of the scale parameters identified in the application submission consistent with generally accepted standards of space about new residential development contrary to Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan, 2024 and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024).

- 2. The proposed development is at variance with the advice contained in Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024) regarding Sustainable Transport in that it is not accessible by a range of different transport modes and will rely on the use of private motor vehicles (para. 4.1.10 refers).
- 3. The proposed development will generate on-street parking on the Classified Route A4063 to the detriment of highway safety contrary to the provisions of PLA11 and SP5 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan, 2024.
- 4. A satisfactory layby arrangement cannot be provided to serve visitor and delivery / service vehicles generated by the proposed development to the detriment of highway safety along the adjoining A4063 (Tondy Road) contrary to the provisions of Policy SP5 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan, 2024.
- 5. The proposed development would generate additional vehicular 'U' turn movements to or from the public highway, creating further traffic hazards to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to the provisions of Policy SP5 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan, 2024.
- 6. The proposed development, by reason of the requirement to fell a number of protected trees, would adversely affect the amenity of the area and biodiversity characteristics of the site and the identified Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) known as Cefn Glass Wood (Graig-y-Casnewydd), contrary to the provisions of Policies DNP5, DNP6, DNP7 and DNP8 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2024) and guidance contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, 2024) and Supplementary Planning Guidance 19 (Biodiversity and Development).

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| APPEAL NO. | 2035 |
| APPLICATION NO | P/24/530/FUL |
| APPELLANT | MR W FRANCIS |
| SUBJECT OF APPEAL | Demolition of existing dormer bungalow and replacement with two storey dwelling and associated works: 11 West Road Porthcawl |
| PROCEDURE | WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS |
| DECISION LEVEL | DELEGATED OFFICER |

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of its design, form, scale and materials, represents an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which is out of keeping with, and harmful to, the established character and appearance of the prevailing built up residential area contrary to Policy SP3 of the Local Development Plan (2024), Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02 Householder Development and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).
- 2. The proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of its siting, design, extent and scale would have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of adjoining neighbours by way of an overbearing and overshadowing impact, contrary to Policy SP3 of the Local Development Plan (2024), Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02 Householder Development and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------|
| APPEAL NO. | 2036 |
| APPLICATION NO | P/25/26/FUL |
| APPELLANT | P J MORGAN MANAGEMENT LTD |

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| SUBJECT OF APPEAL | RE-SUBMISSION & RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR EXTERNAL FIRE ESCAPE STAIRCASE AND LANDING (INCORPORATING 1.8M HIGH OPAQUE POLYCARBONATE INFILL), TO PROVIDE RESIDENTIAL ACCESS TO REAR SHARED GARDEN: TENBY VILLA18 COYCHURCH ROAD BRIDGEND |
| PROCEDURE | WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS |
| DECISION LEVEL | DELEGATED OFFICER |

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The balcony and staircase, by reason of their siting and scale, have an overbearing and dominating impact on the neighbouring property at 20 Coychurch Road, resulting in a significant and unreasonable loss of residential amenity contrary to Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance 2: Householder Development and Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024).
 2. The balcony and staircase, by reason of their siting, height and scale, constitute an unneighbourly and harmful form of development that is detrimental to the existing levels of residential amenity and privacy currently enjoyed by the occupiers of 16, 18 (ground floor flat) and 20 Coychurch Road, contrary to Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance 2: Householder Development and Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024).
-

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| APPEAL NO. | 2037 |
| APPLICATION NO | P/24/645/FUL |
| APPELLANT | MR H PRICE & FAMILY |
| SUBJECT OF APPEAL | RETENTION OF EXISTING HARD STANDING AREA AND FENCING, THE PROVISION OF 2 STATIC RESIDENTIAL GYPSY CARAVANS & 2 TOURING CARAVANS, 2 UTILITY/DAY ROOMS, CAR PARKING, BOUNDARY FENCING, ECOLOGICAL ENHANCEMENTS WHICH INCLUDE THE REMOVAL OF SOME AREAS OF HARDSTANDING WITH PLANTING AREAS, AND THE INSTALLATION OF A PRIVATE TREATMENT PLANT (REVISED INFORMATION INCLUDING AMENDED SITE PLAN, DRAINAGE & SEWERAGE DETAILS, & A TRANSPORT STATEMENT): ROSE MEADOW YARD CROFT TOP FARM LALESTON |
| PROCEDURE | HEARING |
| DECISION LEVEL | DELEGATED OFFICER |

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The access lacks adequate visibility to the serve the proposed development and the intensification of the access on the brow of a hill would create traffic hazards to the detriment of highway safety contrary to policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, 2024)
2. The proposed development will generate additional vehicular turning movements to or from the public highway, creating further traffic hazards to the detriment of highway safety. contrary to policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, 2024)
3. The proposed development is at variance with the advice contained in Planning Policy Wales 12, Future Wales and Wellbeing of Future Generations act regarding Sustainable Transport in that it is in a remote location that is not safely accessible by a range of different transport modes and will rely on the use of private motor vehicles (para. 4.1.10 refers). contrary to policy SP3 and SP5 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, 2024).
4. The proposal, by reason of its siting, layout, design and scale, represents an inappropriate and unjustified form of development which will have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of this countryside location, contrary to policies COM8, DNP1 and SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, 2024) TAN12-Design and Welsh Government Circular 005/2018 Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (June 2018).

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| APPEAL NO. | 2040 |
| APPLICATION NO | P/25/57/FUL |
| APPELLANT | MR D JONES |
| SUBJECT OF APPEAL | RETROSPECTIVE CONSENT FOR A GARDEN SHED TO BE USED FOR STORAGE OF GARDEN ITEMS AND BICYCLES: 18 GARN ROAD MAESTEG |
| PROCEDURE | HOUSEHOLDER |
| DECISION LEVEL | DELEGATED OFFICER |

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The development, by reason of its siting, size and scale, represents an excessive, incongruous and overly prominent form of development, projecting forward of the principal elevation of the dwelling, 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 Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02 Householder Development, Technical Advice Note 12 Design (2016) and Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).
2. The development, by reason of its siting, scale, height and proximity to the boundary with 19 Garn Road would represent an unneighbourly form of development having an unreasonably dominant, overbearing and overshadowing impact on this property, to the detriment of the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of this property. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02 Householder Development, Technical Advice Note 12 Design (2016) and Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).

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

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| APPEAL NO. | 2032 |
| APPLICATION NO | P/24/274/FUL |
| APPELLANT | K FERNANDEZ |
| SUBJECT OF APPEAL | ERECTION OF BOUNDARY FENCE: 11 KINGFISHER CLOSE BRACKLA |
| 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. |

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

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| APPEAL NO. | 2038 |
| APPLICATION NO | P/24/631/FUL |
| APPELLANT | MR W J FLEMING |
| SUBJECT OF APPEAL | SINGLE STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION, REAR DORMER WITH 2 X JULIET BALCONIES, ALTERATIONS TO ROOF RIDGE AND PORCH (PART RETROSPECTIVE): 103 HEOL LAS NORTH CORNELLY |
| PROCEDURE | HOUSEHOLDER |
| 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 Appeal decision is attached as **APPENDIX B.**

Attached as **Appendices C and D** are the latest appeals statistics from PEDW (Planning and Environment Decisions Wales) by Local Planning Authority (LPA).

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 Zoe Baxter BSc, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 30/09/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04249-J9D5K3

Site address: 11 Clos Glas Y Dorlan, Brackla, Bridgend CF31 2NY

- 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 Ms Karen Fernandez against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/24/274/FUL, dated 30 May 2024, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2025.
 - The development proposed is erection of boundary fence.
 - A site visit was made on 3 September 2025.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of boundary fence at 11 Clos Glas Y Dorlan, Brackla, Bridgend CF31 2NY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/24/274/FUL, dated 30 May 2024, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision letter.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's Decision Notice as this most concisely describes the development.
3. It is evident from the submissions and my site visit that a new fence is already in place. However, I note that this differs from the proposed plans which show the fence and a trellis on top in a revised location (Plan D). As such, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the latest submitted plans, as per the Council's decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area;
 - the safety and convenience of pedestrians; and
 - biodiversity interests.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a residential dwelling and associated rear garden which backs onto the highway, Coychurch Road to the south and public footpath to the west. The development involves new fencing to the rear boundary and part of the western boundary.

6. Policy SP3 of Bridgend Local Development Plan (LDP) requires development to have a design of the highest quality possible, whilst respecting and enhancing local distinctiveness and landscape character and be appropriate to its local context in terms of size, scale, height, massing, elevational treatment, materials and detailing, layout, form, mix and density. Note 7 of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 02 – Householder Development advises boundary fences should respect the residential amenity of neighbours and the character of the dwelling and its context.
7. The proposed fence would be of similar colour, style and design as the previous fence at the site, albeit set closer to the highway beyond the existing tree coverage situated along the southern boundary of the appeal site. As such, the proposed fence would be noticeable when viewed from the highway compared to the previous fence and that at neighbouring properties which are largely screened by the existing treeline and vegetation during summer months. However, I observed during my site visit that further along Coychurch Road to the east, a boundary fence with lower fir trees and decorative chippings to the front are clearly evident from the highway. In addition, to the southeast of the site on Coychurch Road, just beyond the access for Long Acre, there is a long stretch of close boarded fence directly adjacent to the pavement. As such, although not immediately adjacent to the site, close boarded fencing does feature in the surrounding area and is clearly visible at various points when travelling along the highway near to the site and therefore contributes to the context in which the development would be viewed.
8. The proposed plan (Plan D) shows that the new fence would be set back from the pavement between 0.85m and 1.5m. The Council dispute that the proposed vegetation within the appellant's garden and overhanging the fence would provide mitigation sufficient for the identified harm or would represent an unacceptable change in the locality. I acknowledge that, during the summer months in particular, there would be a change in appearance from Coychurch Road compared to the original fence at the site. However, the photographic evidence presented by the appellant shows the significant change in visibility of the boundary fences of properties in Clos Glas Y Dorlan outside of the summer months and following cutback and maintenance of the vegetation adjacent to the footway. As such, taking account of the context described above and the varying views in different seasons, the proposed boundary fence would not be an overtly dominant or incongruous feature of the streetscene.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would therefore comply with the relevant criteria of Policy SP3 of the LDP and the aims of the SPG.

Safety and convenience of pedestrians

10. Policy SP3 of the LDP requires development to maximise opportunities for active travel and minimise opportunities for crime to be generated or increased. LDP Policy SP5 is not supportive of development proposals which have a negative impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network and Policy PLA9 requires any adverse impacts on the character, safety, enjoyment and convenient use of a public right of way must be mitigated.
11. An existing pedestrian footway runs from Clos Glas Y Dorlan in the north between residential dwellings to Coychurch Road to the south with close boarded fencing on both sides resulting in limited natural surveillance on the path. The Council refer to the provision of a visibility splay at junctions of pedestrian footways to help reduce collisions and consider the extended fence would increase the opportunity for crime and fear of crime. No specific distance identified in planning policy or guidance is cited by the Council for visibility splays to footways. Given that the footway junction with Coychurch

Road is visible the entire length of the footpath and a barrier is in place between the footpath and highway, I consider that pedestrians would be approaching the junction with caution. Similarly, due to the footway's length and fairly straight orientation it is possible to see the opposite end of the path from each direction which helps to reduce the potential for crime and fear of crime. Furthermore, the proposal would result in a slight reduction in the length of the boundary fence to the east of the footway compared to the situation observed on site and therefore reduces any risk to pedestrian safety, such that no unacceptable harm would occur.

12. Based on the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposed fence would not reduce visibility or create an area of concealment to an extent which would result in harm to the safety or convenience of pedestrians. I therefore find that the proposal complies with the relevant criteria of LDP Policies SP3, SP5 and PLA9.

Biodiversity interests

13. Policy 9 of Future Wales states in all cases, action towards securing the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity (to provide a net benefit) must be demonstrated as part of development proposals through innovative, nature-based approaches to site planning and the design of the built environment. A Green Infrastructure Statement (GIS) as sought by Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12) (PPW) has been provided.
14. The Council raise concern over the fence causing a break in the green border adjoining the highway. I acknowledge that the proposed fence would be situated within the area which previously compromised a band of vegetation between the gardens of properties in Clos Glas Y Dorlan and the highway. PPW notes that a GIS will be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development proposed and in the case of minor development this will be a short description and should not be an onerous requirement for applicants. The submitted statement confirms that the existing trees would be retained and additional trees would be planted in the southeastern corner of the site adjacent to the new fence.
15. As such, the proposal would not result in the loss of any trees and the trees would continue to be a green infrastructure asset and provide connectivity, particularly for nesting birds and bats alongside the additional proposed trees. The appellant also highlights the benefits associated with relocating the fence to remove the opportunity for the area between the trees and footway to be used for rubbish and dumping of building and garden waste to the detriment of biodiversity. Furthermore, during my visit I observed regrowth of vegetation adjacent to the highway. As such, I am satisfied that the proposed fence would not unacceptably harm the local eco system and the proposed tree planting in the submitted statement suitably demonstrates the potential for securing biodiversity enhancement at the site as part of the development. Further details could be secured via a condition.
16. Based on the evidence before me I am satisfied that the proposal would secure the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity to secure a net gain as required by Policy 9 of Future Wales. In addition, it would comply with the relevant requirements of LDP Policies SP3, SP4, SP17, DNP6, DNP7 and DNP8 in regard to safeguarding and enhancing biodiversity and maintaining and where possible, enhancing the natural environment. It would also accord with the aims of Chapter 6 of PPW.

Other Matters

17. The Council raise no concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and I find no reason to disagree.

18. Notwithstanding the submitted GIS, a condition is imposed requiring submission of a biodiversity enhancement scheme to include details, locations and timescale for implementation of the measures set out within the submitted GIS.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
20. 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.

Z. Baxter

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:
- Location plan – Land Registry Title Plan (received at Bridgend County Borough Council on 30.05.2024);
 - Plan showing fence D, including dimensions for the setback of the fence from the back edge of the footway on Coychurch Road (received at Bridgend County Borough Council on 14.10.2024);
 - Elevation drawing of the proposed side fence (received at Bridgend County Borough Council on 25.11.2024);
 - Elevation drawing of the proposed back fence (received at Bridgend County Borough Council on 25.11.2024); and
 - Green Infrastructure Statement ref. KF P24272FUL.

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

- 3) No development shall take place until a scheme for biodiversity enhancement on the site (excluding any area designated as highway land) has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity, in accordance with Future Wales Policy 9 and Policies SP3, SP4, SP17, DNP6, DNP7 and DNP8 of the Bridgend County Borough Local Development Plan 2018 – 2033 (2024).



Appeal Decision

by Zoe Baxter BSc, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 25/09/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04433-L7Q8Y2

Site address: 103 Heol Las, North Cornelly, Bridgend, CF33 4DN

- 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 W J Fleming against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/24/631/FUL, dated 18 January 2025, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2025.
 - The development is single storey rear and side extension, rear dormer with 2 x Juliet balconies, alterations to roof ridge and porch (part retrospective)
 - A site visit was made on 3 September 2025.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to alterations to the porch. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to a single storey rear and side extension, rear dormer with 2 x Juliet balconies and alterations to roof ridge and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear and side extension, rear dormer with 2 x Juliet balconies and alterations to roof ridge at 103 Heol Las, North Cornelly, Bridgend CF33 4DN, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/24/631/FUL, dated 18 January 2025 subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision letter.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's Decision Notice and the appeal form as this most concisely describes the development.
3. Planning permission was previously granted in April 2019 for single storey extensions to rear and side elevations, a loft conversion with dormer and new pitched roof over porch under reference. P/19/8/FUL. The appellant contends that changes occurred to the permitted scheme during the construction period resulting in the submission of the scheme before me. As the development has been largely completed retrospective planning permission is therefore sought. For the avoidance of doubt, my decision is based on the information given on the submitted plans and as set out in the description of development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling fronting Heol Las within a predominantly residential area. Adjacent properties are of similar style and design being single storey detached dwellings, whilst the wider area contains a mix of property types including two storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings.
6. Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (LDP) requires development to, amongst other matters, have a design of the highest quality possible, whilst respecting and enhancing local distinctiveness and landscape character. The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) Note 02 Householder Development advises that the form, materials, and details of extensions and alterations should match or harmonise with those of the existing house.
7. Dealing firstly with the proposed porch, the submitted plans indicate this is the same footprint as that previously approved at the site under planning permission reference. P/19/8/FUL. However, the design now proposed comprises a higher front facing gable roof adjoining with the existing front facing gable at the property. Although the submitted plans show that the ridge height of the porch is slightly lower than the adjacent front gable, it is significantly higher than the original porch's flat roof and the approved porch. The scale and design of the porch competes with rather than harmonises or complements the existing front gable and dominates the front elevation of the property. It is clearly visible from the streetscene of both Heol Las and Heol Llan where it appears as an obtrusive and conflicting structure. I disagree with the appellant's claim that the porch is consistent with that at neighbouring property 105 Heol Las, which has a single front facing gable in proportion with the main dwelling. Whereas the porch at the appeal site unbalances the host dwelling.
8. The proposed stone cladding would exacerbate its prominence and obtrusiveness within the streetscene. Whilst I note the appellant suggests alternative materials could be considered to tie in with the host dwelling and surrounding properties and is willing to accept a condition in this regard. I am not satisfied that a change in material would alleviate the harm associated with the scale and form of the roof of the porch and its relationship with the host dwelling which conflicts with the requirements of LDP Policy SP3 and the objectives of the SPG.
9. Turning to the increase in ridge height of the main roof and the rear dormer roof, both alterations have been carried out and were observed on my site visit. I note the advice within the SPG in regard to changes to a roof usually being prominent and concur that the increase in ridge height through the installation of the additional course of slate and thick ridge tile is visible from the streetscene. However, when observed from Heol Las the ridge height of the dwelling does not appear noticeably greater than that at neighbouring properties and therefore does not result in significant detriment to the scale or form of the appeal property. The minimal increase in height and extent of change from the permitted plans do not unduly disrupt the similar roof form and design observed at neighbouring properties 101 and 105 Heol Las. Therefore, it does not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the property or the surrounding area.
10. The Council does not allege harm in relation to effects associated with the rear and side extensions and alterations including two Juliet balconies, rooflights and different finishing materials. I have no reason to find otherwise and consider that these aspects of the appeal scheme along with the slight increase in ridge height of the main roof and dormer extension roof accord with the objective of Policy SP3 of the LDP for development to be appropriate to its local context. Nonetheless, for the reasons given above I conclude that the alterations to the porch harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to LDP Policy SP3 and the aims of the SPG.

Other Matters

11. The development involves an increased ridge height and fenestration changes to rear first floor windows along with other external alterations from the previously permitted scheme. I have considered the concerns raised by third parties in relation to the impact of the increased ridge height and new Juliet balcony on their living conditions. Whilst the minor increase in ridge height can be observed at the site, the difference from the permitted scheme does not result in harm by way of loss of light or overbearance to the neighbouring occupiers. The rear dormer extension now comprises two Juliet balconies to the rear elevation. However, the balconies do not project forward and I observed during my visit that the railings as shown on the submitted plans have been installed removing the opportunity to exit the dormer extension onto the rear flat roof extension. As such, I am satisfied that the introduction of a second Juliet balcony does not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers.
12. Loss of car parking has also been raised by third parties. However, the Council do not raise concern and as the submitted plans show no changes to the parking arrangements I find no reason to disagree.
13. Furthermore, concerns have been raised by a number of third parties in relation to how the enforcement investigations were carried out and the way the planning application was determined by the Council. However, these are not matters that are material to my consideration of this appeal. Accordingly, I have given these issues no weight in my decision.

Conditions

14. Given that the development has commenced, the standard time limit condition is not necessary. A condition listing the approved plans in so far as they relate to the single storey rear and side extension, rear dormer with 2 x Juliet balconies and alterations to roof ridge is necessary, as is a condition requiring installation of a bird box to provide biodiversity enhancement at the site in line with Policy 9 of Future Wales.

Conclusion

15. I have found that the alterations to the rear and side extensions and rear dormer with 2 x Juliet balconies are acceptable in terms of the effect on the character and appearance of the area. I have also concluded that the increase in ridge height of the main dwelling and rear dormer extension does not have an unduly harmful effect on the character or appearance of the property or the surrounding area. However, the alterations to the porch design result in an obtrusive structure which dominates the front elevation of the host dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the property and streetscene. As the porch alterations are clearly severable from the other elements of the scheme, I have issued a split decision.
16. For the reasons given above and having regard to 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.
17. 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.

Z Baxter

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

- Site Location Plan;
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (drawing no. 3 of 6);
- Proposed First Floor Plan (drawing no. 4 of 6); and
- Proposed Elevations 'As built' (drawing no. 5 of 6).

insofar as those plans relate to the single storey rear and side extension, rear dormer with 2 x Juliet balconies and alterations to the main roof ridge.

Reason: To ensure the development accords with the approved plans submitted with the application.

- 2) Within 2 months from the date of this permission, an artificial nesting site for birds shall be erected at the site to the following specifications, and retained as such thereafter;

Nest Box Specifications 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 buildings or a suitable location within the garden
- Entrance holes: 32mm diameter
- Dimensions: H310 x W370 x D185mm

Reason: In the interest of biodiversity and to mitigate any loss of bird nesting/foraging habitats under the Habitats Regulations (amended 2012) and to accord with Policy SP2 of the adopted Bridgend Local Development Plan.

Planning Appeals **Only** (including householder and minor commercial) arising from an application for planning permission April 2024 - March 2025

Decisions (number)

| LPA | Allowed | Dismissed | Total |
|----------------|---------|-----------|-------|
| Anglesey | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| BBNP | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Blaenau Gwent | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Bridgend | 3 | 12 | 15 |
| Caerphilly | 12 | 19 | 31 |
| Cardiff | 9 | 31 | 40 |
| Carmarthen | 4 | 25 | 29 |
| Ceredigion | 2 | 9 | 11 |
| Conwy | 4 | 11 | 15 |
| Denbigh | 2 | | 2 |
| Flint | 4 | 12 | 16 |
| Gwynedd | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Merthyr Tydfil | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| Monmouth | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| Newport | 8 | 16 | 24 |
| NPT | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| PCNP | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| Pembroke | 5 | 6 | 11 |
| Powys | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| RCT | 8 | 11 | 19 |
| SNP | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Swansea | 12 | 44 | 56 |
| Torfaen | 1 | 13 | 14 |
| Vale of Glam | 3 | 26 | 29 |
| Wrexham | 2 | 15 | 17 |
| Grand Total | 98 | 315 | 413 |

Decisions (percentage)

| LPA | Allowed | Dismissed |
|----------------|---------|-----------|
| Anglesey | 37.50 | 62.50 |
| BBNP | 20.00 | 80.00 |
| Blaenau Gwent | 20.00 | 80.00 |
| Bridgend | 20.00 | 80.00 |
| Caerphilly | 38.71 | 61.29 |
| Cardiff | 22.50 | 77.50 |
| Carmarthen | 13.79 | 86.21 |
| Ceredigion | 18.18 | 81.82 |
| Conwy | 26.67 | 73.33 |
| Denbigh | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Flint | 25.00 | 75.00 |
| Gwynedd | 33.33 | 66.67 |
| Merthyr Tydfil | 14.29 | 85.71 |
| Monmouth | 30.00 | 70.00 |
| Newport | 33.33 | 66.67 |
| NPT | 16.67 | 83.33 |
| PCNP | 10.00 | 90.00 |
| Pembroke | 45.45 | 54.55 |
| Powys | 25.00 | 75.00 |
| RCT | 42.11 | 57.89 |
| SNP | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Swansea | 21.43 | 78.57 |
| Torfaen | 7.14 | 92.86 |
| Vale of Glam | 10.34 | 89.66 |
| Wrexham | 11.76 | 88.24 |
| Grand Total | 23.73 | 76.27 |

Appeals by LPA (Planning, LBC, LDC, Adverts & s106) April 2024 - March 2025

Decisions (number)

| LPA | Allowed | Dismissed | Total |
|----------------|---------|-----------|-------|
| Anglesey | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| BBNP | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Blaenau Gwent | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Bridgend | 3 | 12 | 15 |
| Caerphilly | 12 | 20 | 32 |
| Cardiff | 9 | 35 | 44 |
| Carmarthen | 6 | 29 | 35 |
| Ceredigion | 2 | 11 | 13 |
| Conwy | 4 | 11 | 15 |
| Denbigh | 2 | | 2 |
| Flint | 5 | 12 | 17 |
| Gwynedd | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Merthyr Tydfil | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| Monmouth | 3 | 8 | 11 |
| Newport | 9 | 16 | 25 |
| NPT | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| PCNP | 3 | 9 | 12 |
| Pembroke | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Powys | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| RCT | 8 | 11 | 19 |
| SNP | 1 | 10 | 11 |
| Swansea | 13 | 47 | 60 |
| Torfaen | 1 | 13 | 14 |
| Vale of Glam | 3 | 27 | 30 |
| Wrexham | 2 | 15 | 17 |
| Grand Total | 108 | 335 | 443 |

Decisions (percentage)

| LPA | Allowed | Dismissed |
|----------------|---------|-----------|
| Anglesey | 37.50 | 62.50 |
| BBNP | 20.00 | 80.00 |
| Blaenau Gwent | 20.00 | 80.00 |
| Bridgend | 20.00 | 80.00 |
| Caerphilly | 37.50 | 62.50 |
| Cardiff | 20.45 | 79.55 |
| Carmarthen | 17.14 | 82.86 |
| Ceredigion | 15.38 | 84.62 |
| Conwy | 26.67 | 73.33 |
| Denbigh | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Flint | 29.41 | 70.59 |
| Gwynedd | 33.33 | 66.67 |
| Merthyr Tydfil | 12.50 | 87.50 |
| Monmouth | 27.27 | 72.73 |
| Newport | 36.00 | 64.00 |
| NPT | 28.57 | 71.43 |
| PCNP | 25.00 | 75.00 |
| Pembroke | 50.00 | 50.00 |
| Powys | 22.22 | 77.78 |
| RCT | 42.11 | 57.89 |
| SNP | 9.09 | 90.91 |
| Swansea | 21.67 | 78.33 |
| Torfaen | 7.14 | 92.86 |
| Vale of Glam | 10.00 | 90.00 |
| Wrexham | 11.76 | 88.24 |
| Grand Total | 24.38 | 75.62 |

Enforcement (s174, s39 (LBC))

Decisions (number)

| LPA | Notice Upheld | Varied & Upheld | Planning Permission Granted | Quashed on Legal Ggounds | Split Decision | Total |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------|
| Anglesey | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| BBNP | | | | | | 0 |
| Blaenau Gwent | 5 | 3 | | | | 8 |
| Bridgend | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | 6 |
| Caerphilly | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| Cardiff | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Carmarthen | 6 | 6 | | 2 | 1 | 15 |
| Ceredigion | | | | | | 0 |
| Conwy | | | | | | 0 |
| Denbigh | | | | | | 0 |
| Flint | | | | | | 0 |
| Gwynedd | | | | | | 0 |
| Merthyr Tydfil | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Monmouth | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Newport | 5 | 2 | 1 | | | 8 |
| NPT | 1 | 2 | | | | 3 |
| PCNP | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| Pembroke | 3 | 3 | | | | 6 |
| Powys | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| RCT | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| SNP | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Swansea | 6 | 3 | 3 | | | 12 |
| Torfaen | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Vale of Glam | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| Wrexham | 2 | | | | | 2 |
| Grand Total | 37 | 34 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 83 |

& Maintenance of Land)

Decisions (percentage)

| LPA | Notice Upheld | Varied & Upheld | Planning Permission Granted | Quashed on Legal Grounds | Split Decision | Total |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Anglesey | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| BBNP | | | | | | |
| Blaenau Gwent | 62.50 | 37.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37.50 |
| Bridgend | 16.67 | 66.67 | 16.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 66.67 |
| Caerphilly | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Cardiff | 50.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 | 16.67 | 16.67 | 0.00 |
| Carmarthen | 40.00 | 40.00 | 0.00 | 13.33 | 6.67 | 40.00 |
| Ceredigion | | | | | | |
| Conwy | | | | | | |
| Denbigh | | | | | | |
| Flint | | | | | | |
| Gwynedd | | | | | | |
| Merthyr Tydfil | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Monmouth | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Newport | 62.50 | 25.00 | 12.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 |
| NPT | 33.33 | 66.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 66.67 |
| PCNP | 50.00 | 0.00 | 50.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Pembroke | 50.00 | 50.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50.00 |
| Powys | 50.00 | 50.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50.00 |
| RCT | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| SNP | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Swansea | 50.00 | 25.00 | 25.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 |
| Torfaen | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Vale of Glam | 50.00 | 50.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50.00 |
| Wrexham | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Grand Total | 44.58 | 40.96 | 8.43 | 3.61 | 2.41 | 40.96 |

| Planning Appeals Only (including householder and minor commercial) arising from an application for planning permission April 2024 - March 2025 | | | | | | |
|---|---------|-----------|-------|------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Decisions (number) | | | | Decisions (percentage) | | |
| LPA | Allowed | Dismissed | Total | LPA | Allowed | Dismissed |
| Anglesey | 0 | 5 | 5 | Anglesey | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| BBNP | 0 | 1 | 1 | BBNP | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Blaenau Gwent | 0 | 3 | 3 | Blaenau Gwent | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Bridgend | 2 | 10 | 12 | Bridgend | 16.67 | 83.33 |
| Caerphilly | 3 | 10 | 13 | Caerphilly | 23.08 | 76.92 |
| Cardiff | 2 | 7 | 9 | Cardiff | 22.22 | 77.78 |
| Carmarthen | 2 | 12 | 14 | Carmarthen | 14.29 | 85.71 |
| Ceredigion | 4 | 9 | 13 | Ceredigion | 30.77 | 69.23 |
| Conwy | 2 | 7 | 9 | Conwy | 22.22 | 77.78 |
| Denbigh | 0 | 2 | 2 | Denbigh | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Flint | 4 | 6 | 10 | Flint | 40.00 | 60.00 |
| Gwynedd | 3 | 4 | 7 | Gwynedd | 42.86 | 57.14 |
| Merthyr Tydfil | 2 | | 2 | Merthyr Tydfil | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Monmouth | 1 | 5 | 6 | Monmouth | 16.67 | 83.33 |
| Newport | 2 | 10 | 12 | Newport | 16.67 | 83.33 |
| NPT | 1 | 3 | 4 | NPT | 25.00 | 75.00 |
| PCNP | 0 | 5 | 5 | PCNP | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Pembroke | 1 | 3 | 4 | Pembroke | 25.00 | 75.00 |
| Powys | 1 | 5 | 6 | Powys | 16.67 | 83.33 |
| RCT | 3 | 7 | 10 | RCT | 30.00 | 70.00 |
| SNP | 2 | 1 | 3 | SNP | 66.67 | 33.33 |
| Swansea | 9 | 12 | 21 | Swansea | 42.86 | 57.14 |
| Torfaen | 1 | 5 | 6 | Torfaen | 16.67 | 83.33 |
| Vale of Glam | 6 | 11 | 17 | Vale of Glam | 35.29 | 64.71 |
| Wrexham | 0 | 4 | 4 | Wrexham | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Grand Total | 51 | 147 | 198 | Grand Total | 25.76 | 74.24 |

Appeals by LPA (Planning, LBC, LDC, Adverts & s106) April 2024 - March 2025

| Decisions (number) | | | | Decisions (percentage) | | |
|--------------------|---------|-----------|-------|------------------------|---------|-----------|
| LPA | Allowed | Dismissed | Total | LPA | Allowed | Dismissed |
| Anglesey | 0 | 5 | 5 | Anglesey | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| BBNP | 0 | 1 | 1 | BBNP | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Blaenau Gwent | 0 | 3 | 3 | Blaenau Gwent | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Bridgend | 2 | 10 | 12 | Bridgend | 16.67 | 83.33 |
| Caerphilly | 3 | 10 | 13 | Caerphilly | 23.08 | 76.92 |
| Cardiff | 2 | 7 | 9 | Cardiff | 22.22 | 77.78 |
| Carmarthen | 2 | 13 | 15 | Carmarthen | 13.33 | 86.67 |
| Ceredigion | 5 | 13 | 18 | Ceredigion | 27.78 | 72.22 |
| Conwy | 2 | 7 | 9 | Conwy | 22.22 | 77.78 |
| Denbigh | 1 | 3 | 4 | Denbigh | 25.00 | 75.00 |
| Flint | 6 | 7 | 13 | Flint | 46.15 | 53.85 |
| Gwynedd | 3 | 4 | 7 | Gwynedd | 42.86 | 57.14 |
| Merthyr Tydfil | 2 | | 2 | Merthyr Tydfil | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| Monmouth | 1 | 6 | 7 | Monmouth | 14.29 | 85.71 |
| Newport | 2 | 11 | 13 | Newport | 15.38 | 84.62 |
| NPT | 1 | 4 | 5 | NPT | 20.00 | 80.00 |
| PCNP | 0 | 5 | 5 | PCNP | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Pembroke | 1 | 4 | 5 | Pembroke | 20.00 | 80.00 |
| Powys | 1 | 6 | 7 | Powys | 14.29 | 85.71 |
| RCT | 3 | 7 | 10 | RCT | 30.00 | 70.00 |
| SNP | 2 | 2 | 4 | SNP | 50.00 | 50.00 |
| Swansea | 9 | 12 | 21 | Swansea | 42.86 | 57.14 |
| Torfaen | 2 | 5 | 7 | Torfaen | 28.57 | 71.43 |
| Vale of Glam | 6 | 14 | 20 | Vale of Glam | 30.00 | 70.00 |
| Wrexham | 0 | 5 | 5 | Wrexham | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Grand Total | 56 | 164 | 220 | Grand Total | 25.45 | 74.55 |

Enforcement (s174, s39 (LBC) & Maintenance of Land)

| Decisions (number) | | | | | | | Decisions (percentage) | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------|------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|--------|
| LPA | Notice Upheld | Varied & Upheld | Planning Permissi on Granted | Quashed on Legal Grounds | Split Decision | Total | LPA | Notice Upheld | Varied & Upheld | Planning Permissi on Granted | Quashed on Legal Ggrounds | Split Decision | Total |
| Anglesey | | | | | 1 | 1 | Anglesey | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| BBNP | | | | | | 0 | BBNP | | | | | | |
| Blaenau Gwent | | | | | | 0 | Blaenau Gwent | | | | | | |
| Bridgend | 2 | | | | 1 | 3 | Bridgend | 66.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 33.33 | 0.00 |
| Caerphilly | 6 | | 1 | | | 7 | Caerphilly | 85.71 | 0.00 | 14.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Cardiff | 5 | 1 | | | | 6 | Cardiff | 83.33 | 16.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 |
| Carmarthen | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 8 | Carmarthe | 62.50 | 12.50 | 12.50 | 12.50 | 0.00 | 12.50 |
| Ceredigion | | | 1 | | | 1 | Ceredigio | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Conwy | | | | | | 0 | Conwy | | | | | | |
| Denbigh | | 1 | | | | 1 | Denbigh | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Flint | | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | Flint | 0.00 | 33.33 | 66.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 33.33 |
| Gwynedd | 1 | | | | | 1 | Gwynedd | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Merthyr Tydfil | | | | | | 0 | Merthyr Tydfil | | | | | | |
| Monmouth | 4 | | | | | 4 | Monmout | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Newport | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | Newport | 33.33 | 33.33 | 33.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 33.33 |
| NPT | | | | | | 0 | NPT | | | | | | |
| PCNP | 3 | | | | | 3 | PCNP | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Pembroke | 4 | 1 | | | | 5 | Pembroke | 80.00 | 20.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
| Powys | 2 | | | | | 2 | Powys | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| RCT | | 2 | | | | 2 | RCT | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| SNP | | 1 | | | | 1 | SNP | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| Swansea | 2 | | | | | 2 | Swansea | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Torfaen | | | 1 | | | 1 | Torfaen | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Vale of Glam | 1 | | | | | 1 | Vale of Gl | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Wrexham | | 2 | | 1 | | 3 | Wrexham | 0.00 | 66.67 | 0.00 | 33.33 | 0.00 | 66.67 |
| Grand Total | 36 | 11 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 58 | Grand Tot | 62.07 | 18.97 | 12.07 | 3.45 | 3.45 | 18.97 |