

Appeals

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

APPEAL NO.	2043
APPLICATION NO.	P/25/228/FUL
APPELLANT	MR K PARRY
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	FRONT EXTENSION TO ENLARGE LOUNGE
LOCATION OF APPEAL	1 PRESWYLFA COURT MAIN ROAD COYCHURCH
PROCEDURE	HOUSEHOLDER
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its design and form, would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings and would appear visually obtrusive and out of keeping in the street scene, failing to reflect the established character of the area to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area, contrary to policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2018-2033) and advice contained within SPG02: Householder Development and Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).

APPEAL NO.	2041
APPLICATION NO.	P/24/701/FUL
APPELLANT	CARHYS
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	ONE NEW SINGLE STOREY BUNGALOW WITH ONE BEDROOM
LOCATION OF APPEAL	LAND ADJACENT CWM Y COED 1 GER Y BONT BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed remote parking area located at No. 2 Ger y Bont would, in combination with the parking provision for that host property, constitute a poor design solution that fails to integrate with the existing housing, dominating the street scene and being contrary to Policies SP3 and DNP7 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024), the principles contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance 02: Householder Development (2008) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024).
2. The proposed remote parking area located at No. 2 Ger y Bont would demonstrate poor alignment with the principles of Good Design, particularly inclusivity and accessibility for all, and would be contrary to Policy SP3 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024).
3. The proposed remote parking area located at No. 2 Ger y Bont would by reason of its siting and design represent an inappropriate form of development, which would have a harmful impact on the outlook and amenity of the occupants of the host property, contrary to Policy SP3 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024), the principles contained

within Supplementary Planning Guidance 02: Householder Development (2008) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024).

4. The proposed development, by reason of the importation of fill and raising of ground levels, would represent an inappropriate form of development which would result in overlooking and a loss of privacy for the occupants of No. 1 Ger y Bont, resulting in a significant loss of residential amenity contrary to Policy SP3 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024), Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02 Householder Development and Paragraph 2.7 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 13, February 2024).
5. Insufficient details have been submitted with the planning application to enable the implications of the proposal to be properly evaluated by the Local Planning Authority with regard to the proposed importation of material to the site and the expected number of vehicles movements associated with this activity and its impact on the highway network in accordance with Policy SP5 of the Replacement Local Development Plan 2024.
6. The proposed private sewage treatment system is located within a publicly sewered area where private facilities are not considered environmentally acceptable due to the greater risk of failures leading to pollution of the water environment and would be contrary to Policies SP3(i) and DNP9 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and Paragraph 6.6.21 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024).
7. Insufficient/outdated information has been submitted with the planning application to fully determine the impact(s) of the scheme on biodiversity and to demonstrate the proposal complies with Policies SP3, DNP6, DNP7 and DNP8 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024), and advice contained within Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12, February 2024) and Technical Advice Note 5: Nature Conservation and Planning 2009.

The following appeals have been decided 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)
LOCATION OF APPEAL	HEDDFAN FEDERATION LANE PONTYCYMMER
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER
DECISION	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE ALLOWED SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS.

The Appeal decision is attached as APPENDIX A.

APPEAL NO.	2034
APPLICATION NO	P/24/1/OUT
APPELLANT	MR P EVANS
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ONE BLOCK OF 2

LOCATION OF APPEAL	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

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

The application for Costs submitted by the Appellant was also refused.

The Appeal and costs decisions are attached as APPENDIX B

APPEAL NO.	2035
APPLICATION NO	P/25/181/FUL
APPELLANT	MR W FRANCIS
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DORMER BUNGALOW AND REPLACEMENT WITH TWO STOREY DWELLING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS:
LOCATION OF APPEAL	11 WEST ROAD PORTCAWL
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER
DECISION	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE DISMISSED.

The Appeal decision is attached as APPENDIX C

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:
LOCATION OF APPEAL	TENBY VILLA 18 COYCHURCH ROAD BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER
DECISION	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE DISMISSED.

The Appeal decision is attached as APPENDIX D

APPEAL NO.	2044
APPLICATION NO.	P/25/438/FUL

APPELLANT	MR C EDMUNDS
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	REMOVAL OF EXISTING ROOF, CREATE A NEW PITCHED ROOF TO ACCOMMODATE FIRST FLOOR LIVING SPACE; FULL RECONFIGURATION OF GROUND FLOOR LAYOUTS; THERMALLY UPGRADE EXISTING ENVELOPE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS (RE-SUBMISSION FOLLOWING REFUSAL)
LOCATION OF APPEAL	215 WEST ROAD PORTCAWL
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 E.

APPEAL NO.	2046
APPLICATION NO.	P/25/525/FUL
APPELLANT	MR L JAMES
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	DETACHED TRIPLE GARAGE TO FRONT GARDEN
LOCATION OF APPEAL	1 HIGH ST LALESTON
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 F.

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 I Stevens BA (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 16.12.2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04295-J1V9Z2

Site address: Rear of Heddfan, Federation Lane, Pontycymer, Bridgend, CF32 8LQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
- The appeal is made by Mr Stephen Thomas against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/24/92/FUL, dated 5 March 2024, was approved on 28 February 2025 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
- The development permitted is inclusion of land into curtilage with retaining walls and terrace (retrospective).
- The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: 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.
- The reason given for the condition is: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2018-2033).
- A site visit was made on 5 November 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the planning permission Ref: P/24/92/FUL for inclusion of land into curtilage with retaining walls and terrace (retrospective) at Rear of Heddfan, Federation Lane, Pontycymer, Bridgend, CF32 8LQ granted on 28 February 2025 by Bridgend County Borough Council is varied by deleting condition Nos 1, 2 and 4 and substituting condition No 4 for the following new condition:

Within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for landscaping and biodiversity enhancement shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation. On approval by the Local Planning Authority the landscaping and biodiversity enhancement shall be carried out in accordance with the scheme. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from

planting die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policies SP3 and DNP6 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2018-2033), Policy 9 of Future Wales, and Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12).

Background and Main Issue

2. Planning permission has been granted retrospectively for the creation of an extended rear garden at the detached dwelling, Heddfan. The garden is set at 2 levels with connecting steps and is enclosed by fencing. Condition No 2 of the permission requires the 2m-high wooden fence on the lower patio area to be replaced with 1.8m high metal hoop top panel fencing. The fencing would be finished in black and privet hedging planted on the inside. Plastic leaf trellises could be temporarily affixed to the inside fence and removed once the privet hedging grows to a height of 1.8m.
3. The appellant seeks to remove condition No 2 in its entirety. The main issue therefore is whether the condition is necessary, having regard to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupants of Belle-Vue.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to the lower patio area of the extended rear garden. The garden backs on to recreation space including an equipped play area adjacent to Meadow Street. It is located between a steep grassed bank and rear garden of the neighbouring property, Belle-Vue.
5. The lower patio area is a modest space positioned on top of a gabion terrace wall. The rear boundary fencing follows a similar line to that of Belle-Vue, albeit for a much shorter distance. Indeed, the enclosed lower patio area does not extend the full width of Heddfan's plot and narrows further towards the rear boundary.
6. The use of vertical timber panel fencing is a standard boundary enclosure for residential properties as seen at the upper patio boundary for Heddfan and elsewhere in the surrounding residential area. They include the rear fence of the adjacent property, No 1 Federation Lane, a long fence running along part of Meadow Street nearby, and a mix of timber fencing and block walls defining the rear boundaries of properties along Gwaun-Bant.
7. I recognise that stone walls are also present nearby, including along Belle-Vue's rear boundary. However, there is no single dominant boundary material and timber fencing is an established feature in the area. The Council recognise that the fresh appearance of the upper patio side fencing will weather over time and maintain an appearance similar to other boundary enclosures seen to the rear of properties on Federation Lane. Having visited the area, I consider such effects also apply to the lower patio fencing.
8. The equipped play area is enclosed by metal hoop top rail fencing with a blue finish. This may be a standard boundary for play areas, but it is not a defining feature of the wider area. Although the lower patio area is slightly closer to the metal fence than its neighbour, I fail to see why it should be maintained as an open landscaped garden with metal hoop top fencing when the timber fencing in place is like other permeable boundaries. It is not reasonable in the wider visual context for the lower patio area to follow such a prescriptive boundary treatment as that specified in condition No 2.

9. The fencing around the lower patio area is elevated above the adjacent play area. The combined effect of the supporting wall and fence make a tall permeable boundary which is visible from the play area and along Meadow Street. However, this does not mean it is at odds with its surroundings. Whilst taller than the fencing at Belle-Vue it encloses a relatively small area and does not extend for a significant length, being stepped down from the upper patio fencing and continuing the rear boundary line established by its neighbour. Similarly, in elevated views from the recreation ground at the top of the grassed bank, the fencing dimensions does not make it a conspicuous feature. The fence position, height and materials do not disrupt the pattern of development and do not appear out of place in the context I have described.
10. Belle-Vue benefits from a large garden which slopes down towards its rear boundary. Given the area topography, some form of permeable boundary treatment is inevitable around the appeal site to maintain privacy for the neighbouring occupants. The timber fencing enclosing the lower patio area runs along part of the side boundary and is positioned towards the far corner of the neighbouring garden. Whilst elevated above Belle-Vue's side boundary and therefore visible from within its garden, this is only one portion of the longer boundary and given the sloping nature of the garden and staggered height of the fencing along this boundary, it does not significantly dominate outlook from the property.
11. I therefore conclude that condition No 2 is not necessary or reasonable having regard to the character and appearance of the area. The condition does not therefore satisfy all 6 tests in Welsh Government Circular 016/2014 and should be removed. The removal of the condition would also cause no significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. Its removal, and keeping the as-built fencing, would not conflict with the good design principles in Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan 2018-2033, or advice on area character, design quality, and residential amenity in the Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Other Matters and Conditions

12. I note the concerns raised in representations with the fence height near the glass balustrade on the upper patio area. The Council did not raise this as a concern in its decision. Whilst I recognise that the neighbouring garden at Belle-Vue can be seen when stood in this position, views are largely confined to a small corner of the wider garden which includes a greenhouse and patio. Prolonged views are unlikely to be experienced given that it is a small corner section of the upper patio area.
13. Concerns have also been raised regarding the stability of the fence and supporting wall, along with neighbour notification of the works commencing. Such matters are normally covered under separate legal rights, and it is not for the planning system, including this appeal, to duplicate them.
14. Since I have deleted condition No 2, the cross reference to metal fencing in condition No 4 is no longer necessary. As I have the power to vary non-disputed conditions under the terms of this appeal, I have therefore removed the reference from condition No 4 and amended its wording to align with advice in Welsh Government Circular 016/2014. The condition retains its original aim to enhance biodiversity and details of any planting can be agreed by the Council.
15. Condition No 1 does not explain why future maintenance of the development based on the approved landscape plan is needed, particularly when landscaping details will be secured through condition No 4. The approved plan also specifies details for the metal hoop top fencing, as opposed to showing the as-built wooden fence. Except for this detail, the development has been completed in accordance with the plan details. Given

my findings on condition No 2, condition No 1 no longer serves a useful purpose. To avoid potential conflict between this and other conditions, I shall remove condition No 1.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. I will vary planning permission Ref P/24/92/FUL by deleting condition No 2. Consequently, I will also delete conditions No 1 and No 4 and substitute condition No 4 for a new condition as set out in the 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.

I Stevens

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

by Mr Anthony Thickett BA(HONS) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 31/12/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04393-J9P4N6

Site address: Parcel A, Land North of Underhill Cottages, Tondu Road, Bridgend, CF31 4JL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr P Evans against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/24/1/OUT, dated 30 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2024.
- The development proposed is highway improvement works and one block of 2 bedroom apartments. The application is in outline with all matters bar means of access reserved for subsequent approval.
- A site visit was made on 10 December 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The site is part of a larger piece of land stretching along Tondu Road which has been the subject of a number of planning applications since 2019, all refused and dismissed at appeal. The appellant has split the area into Parcel A and Parcel B. An appeal against the non-determination of an outline planning application for Parcel B was dismissed in July 2025 (CAS-03855-D9G8D3).
3. The Council's decision to decline to determine the appeal application, following the dismissal of the last appeal for the larger area, was quashed by the High Court. The judgement makes clear it should not be read as an indication as to how the appeal application should be determined.
4. The appellant submits a Transport and Highway Rebuttal including revised drawings for highway works. Once an appeal is made, schemes may not be varied other than where the application contains a correctable error. The revised plans do not seek to correct drafting errors but propose material amendments to the works proposed to the highway. The revisions are not admissible under Article 26C of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012 (as amended).

Application for costs

5. The application for costs made by Mr Evans against Bridgend County Borough Council is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area,
- the effect of the proposal on highway safety and whether the proposed development is sustainable in transport terms,
- the impact of the proposed development on biodiversity.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site comprises an irregular shaped piece of land adjoining a dual carriageway. The site slopes steeply up from the road and is heavily wooded. The other side of the dual carriageway is dominated by commercial uses, including a car dealership. The trees on the site are the predominant feature on the western side of Tondu Road. Siting and appearance are reserved for subsequent approval but, given the size and shape of the site, the submitted parameters indicate the siting and form of the apartments is likely to be as shown on the illustrative plans.
8. Even in winter, the woodland is a welcome and attractive feature in the street scene, particularly compared to the commercial buildings opposite. The appellant submits an arboricultural assessment which recommends 11 trees be felled because they are dead or allegedly in danger of toppling on to the highway. The proposed development would result in the loss of a significantly greater number of trees than identified as dead or potentially dangerous.
9. The woodland makes a positive contribution to this part of Tondu Road, recognised by it being subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). An appeal against a refusal to fell 33 trees was dismissed in 2022 insofar as it related to 29 trees but allowed in relation to 4 (CAS-01379-M4T9Y9), confirming the important contribution of the woodland to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Replacement planting on the northern, western (in part) and southern boundaries would not mitigate the loss of the woodland. Given the small area that would remain undeveloped on either end of proposed apartments, I am doubtful the proposed 4:1 replacement for felled trees is achievable. The adverse impact of the loss of the trees alone provides compelling grounds to dismiss the appeal.
11. The group of dwellings to the south of the site are two storey and traditional in appearance. The submitted parameters suggest a 3 storey flat roofed block which would pay no regard to the domestic architecture on this side of Tondu Road. The block would appear as an isolated, contrived development, offering little to the street scene and definitely not making up for the loss of trees. I conclude the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with Policies SP3 and DNP7 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan 2018 – 2033, adopted 2024 (LDP).

Highway safety

12. Tondu Road is a busy dual carriageway subject to a 50mph speed limit as it passes the site. There is no footway on the western side from around 65m to the south of the appeal site. I inspected the site from the footway on the eastern side as I did not deem it safe to walk along the verge on the western side. The appellant's case is largely predicated on the revised plans and a reduction of the speed limit. The revised plans are not before me and the Highway Authority does not support reducing the speed limit.
13. The appellant proposes taking out the nearside lane on the western side of the dual carriageway to provide a footway and layby to serve the proposed flats. The Highway Authority point to flaws in the proposed highway design and the appellant's road safety audit. The margin between a new footway/cycleway would only be 0.5m wide when it should be a minimum 1.5m alongside a 50mph road, further the design of the proposed layby is for a road with a 30mph speed limit. The appellant does not dispute the road safety audit only relates to the proposed footway/cycleway and crossing and does not extend to any highway safety concerns resulting from other aspects of the proposed development.
14. The proposed apartments would be served by a layby only, no on site parking is proposed. The nearest bus stops to the site are not in use. The nearest public transport is Bridgend bus station, around 700m away. This is far in excess of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation's recommended maximum walking distance to bus stops of 500m.
15. The Councils parking standards require a maximum of 1 space per bedroom unit plus one visitor space per 5 units which adds up to a requirement of at least 19 spaces. National policy seeks to reduce reliance on the private car and it is reasonable to reduce local standards in sustainable locations. Given the distance to the bus station and town centre and lack of footway, residents are likely to be reliant on the private car. It is unreasonable to expect prospective residents to brave the busy dual carriageway to reach cars parked on the residential streets off Tondu Road. In the absence of safe, convenient and feasible alternatives, I do not consider the site is suitable for a zero parking development.
16. In addition to being inadequate in terms of design, I share the Council's concerns the proposed layby would be inadequate to accommodate the number of vehicle movements likely to be generated by 9 apartments. The appellant assumes 8 two way trips per day but this feels too low for 9 apartments when you consider the lack of a feasible alternative for journeys to work, shops, schools etc. In the absence of parking on site, residents would be tempted to park in the layby to unload shopping and drop it into the apartment. Should there be no space in the layby, residents may be tempted to park in the road, to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow of traffic.
17. The dual carriageway has a grassed central reservation; it is a long way in either direction to a roundabout. Without measures to deter it, the proposal would increase the likelihood of hazardous U turns at the beginning of the dual carriageway to the south of the site, close to the junction with Mill Lane and at the gap in the reservation affording access to the Trews Field Industrial Estate. In addition to the works shown on the revised plan not before me, the measures proposed to deter U turns depend on a reduction in the speed limit which is not supported by the Highway Authority.
18. A draft unilateral undertaking proposes a contribution of £18,000 to fund the proposed pedestrian/cycle facilities, and layby and traffic regulation orders. This sum would be inadequate to cover the cost of the works proposed. Further, the unilateral undertaking is

in draft, not signed and I give it little weight. I conclude the proposed development would be detrimental to highway safety and conflicts with Policies SP5 and PA11 of the LDP.

Biodiversity

19. The appeal site sits within the Cefn Glas Wood Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). It is designated for being semi-natural woodland with an assemblage of indicator species and also contains disused quarries with shaded rock exposures and scrub. In addition to the habitat created by the trees, the site currently benefits from a diverse ground flora of ecological value. This would be lost either through building or replaced by lawns or yards. In addition to being sceptical of achieving a 4:1 replacement of felled trees, given the, size and shape of the site and that the proposed apartments would have a considerable footprint, I do not see how there would be enough room to create wildflower meadows.
20. The provision of green roofs, sustainable drainage, bat and bird boxes does not outweigh the effective destruction of a significant part of the SINC, never mind provide enhancement as required by Policy 9 of Future Wales. The appellant argues the lack of objection from NRW overrides the concerns of the Council's ecologist but NRW make clear its decision not to comment does not rule out potential impact on environmental interests of local importance. I conclude the proposed development would have an adverse impact on biodiversity and conflicts with Policy DNP 5 of the LDP.

Other matters

21. The proposed rear amenity area would be dominated and overshadowed by trees, the impact exacerbated by the steep bank. The trees, due to their proximity and size would have an unacceptable visual impact on prospective occupiers, this adverse impact would be made worse by the proposed replacement planting. The apartments would sit cheek by jowl against the busy dual carriage way. The noise and emissions from vehicles is likely to mean residents would be reluctant to open windows. Whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for prospective residents is not a reason for refusal. However, my findings in this regard add weight to my conclusion the appeal should be dismissed. This, together with my findings on the main issues, leads me to question whether residential development here constitutes good placemaking.
22. The appellant proposes the units would be 100% affordable housing. The unilateral undertaking submitted with the appeal application is in draft and there is, therefore, no mechanism before me to secure the provision of affordable housing. Further, I have seen nothing indicating a Registered Social Landlord would be willing or able to take the proposed units (clause 2.4 of the unilateral undertaking).

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.
24. 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. This decision accords with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards the Welsh Ministers' well-being objective of making our cities, towns and villages even better places in which to live and work.

A Thickett

Inspector



Costs Decision

by Mr A Thickett BA (Hons) BTP Dip RSA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 31/12/2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal: CAS-04393-J9P4N6

Site address: Parcel A Land North of Underhill Cottages Tondu Road Bridgend CF31 4JL

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322C and Schedule 6.
- The application is made by Mr P Evans for a full award of costs against Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The appeal was made against the refusal of outline planning permission for highway improvement works and one block of 2 bedroom apartments.
- A site visit was made on 10 December 2025.

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. Section 12 Annex 'Award of Costs' of the Development Management Manual advises that, irrespective of the outcome of an appeal, costs may only be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably, thereby causing the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. The High Court judgement made no comment on the merits of the proposed development. Neither the Council nor I were bound to grant planning permission because the Council's decision to decline to determine the appeal application was quashed.
4. Had the Council determined the application when it was first submitted, the outcome would have been the same. The Council produced evidence to substantiate its objections. I agreed with it on all counts and dismissed the appeal. I find unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary expense, as described in the Annex, is not demonstrated and the application for an award of costs fails.

A Thickett

Inspector



Appeal Decision

by Mr Anthony Thickett BA(HONS) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 23/12/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04404-D5Q8C5

Site address: 11 West Road, Nottage, Porthcawl, CF36 3SN

- 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 Francis against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/25/181/FUL, dated 25 March 2025, was refused by notice dated 8 May 2025.
- The development proposed is a replacement dwelling.
- A site visit was made on 10 December 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:

- the street scene in West Road,
- the living conditions of neighbouring residents by way of privacy, loss of light and visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. West Road is characterised by a mix of houses, bungalows and dormer bungalows of different shapes and sizes. The appeal site is a dormer bungalow in a row of 6, book ended by houses. All the bungalows have dormers bar one. The bungalows are modest in size; the upper floors being contained in the roof space reducing their mass and bulk.
4. The appellant seeks to replace the bungalow with a house with full height eaves at first floor. The proposed house would sit roughly in the middle of this row of modest properties. Due to its height, mass and bulk, it would stand out as an incongruous and dominating feature, significantly at odds with its smaller neighbours. It would pay no respect to the form of the dormer bungalows, including the property at the north western end of the row, which although larger than the others, respects their form. I conclude the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the street scene in West Road

and conflicts with Policy SP3 (a & b) of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan, adopted 2024.

Living conditions

5. No. 9 has a ground floor window in the rear elevation to a living room and a bathroom window in a rear offshoot facing the shared boundary. The submitted plan shows a 45° line from the centre of the living room window to No. 9. This is often used to assess the impact of a proposed building on light reaching a window, structures intruding into this line likely having an adverse impact. The two storey element of the proposed dwelling would not intrude into this line. Given the position and orientation of the existing and proposed buildings, I do not consider the proposed development would lead to an unacceptable loss of light to No.9. Nor, given the limited extent to which the proposed two storey element would extend beyond the rear elevation of No. 9, do I consider it would have an unacceptable visual impact on the enjoyment of its house and garden.
6. The proposed dining room includes a window facing the shared boundary with No.9. There is a substantial shrub and a 1.5m fence on this part of the boundary and overlooking could be avoided by a taller fence. The window to bedroom 1 facing No. 13 would be fitted with obscure glazing. I conclude the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and complies with Policy SP3 (k) of the LDP.

Other matter

7. Whilst fitting the window to bedroom 1 with obscure glazing may prevent overlooking, it would be the only window to the bedroom other than a rooflight, neither of which would offer any outlook from that room. This does not constitute good design and adds weight to my conclusion the appeal should be dismissed.

Conclusion

8. My findings regarding the living conditions of neighbouring residents is outweighed by the harm identified to the street scene in West Road. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.
9. 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. This decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards the Welsh Ministers' well-being objective of making our cities, towns and villages even better places in which to live and work.

A Thickett

Inspector



Appeal Decision

by G Hall BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 15/01/2025

Appeal reference: CAS-04436-B2Y4X1

Site address: Tenby Villa, 18 Coychurch Road, Bridgend, CF31 3AP

- 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 Philip Morgan (P.J. Morgan Management Limited) against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/25/26/FUL, dated 16 January 2025, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2025.
- The development is 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.
- A site visit was made on 8 January 2026.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice and the appeal form, as these provide a fuller description of the appeal scheme. As the development has commenced, I have considered the appeal as one seeking planning permission under section 73A(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terraced, two-storey building comprising two flats, one at ground-floor level and one at first-floor level. Both the appeal property and its adjoining neighbours are relatively small, with compact rear gardens, creating a close-knit arrangement where relationships between properties are particularly sensitive.
5. An external staircase has been constructed at the rear of the property, providing the first-floor flat with access to the rear garden. At the top of the staircase is a small landing, onto which a door opens. Due to its small size, the appellant describes this area as a landing rather than a balcony. Notwithstanding its description or intended use, the key

considerations are its size, position, and potential for use, and the resulting effect on the privacy and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

6. The staircase and landing are positioned immediately adjacent to the shared boundaries with the adjoining properties on either side. Given the constrained size of the gardens and the close-knit layout of the properties, the elevated structure appears imposing and overbearing. It also gives rise to a pronounced and intrusive sense of overlooking, resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy for both adjoining occupiers and the occupiers of the ground-floor flat when using their garden.
7. I accept that the landing is relatively small, which limits its potential for prolonged or intensive use. However, it is clearly capable of being stood on and, even with the door opening outwards, could accommodate periods of sitting or casual outdoor activity. As such, the landing could be used in a manner that goes beyond purely transitional access, with associated implications for overlooking and loss of privacy. I acknowledge that, as is typical in terraced settings, the proximity of dwellings and the presence of upper-floor windows mean there is an existing degree of mutual overlooking. In places, views into rear gardens along this part of Coychurch Road are also possible from the rear access lane. However, these existing relationships do not justify an external staircase and landing that materially increase overlooking to an unacceptable degree.
8. The appellant proposes the erection of 1.8-metre-high privacy screens to the sides of the landing, as shown on the submitted drawings. Whilst such screens would reduce some lateral views, they would not adequately mitigate harmful overlooking from the front of the landing or from the staircase itself. In these positions, clear and direct views into adjoining gardens would remain.
9. The appellant refers to fire-safety obligations on landlords that may necessitate a safe means of access or egress. However, no evidence has been provided as to the nature or extent of any such requirements, nor that the existing staircase is the only means of achieving compliance. In the absence of such evidence, this consideration does not outweigh the identified harm to living conditions.
10. I also recognise the appellant's wish to provide the first-floor flat with direct access to the rear garden, including for reasons of health and wellbeing, outdoor drying of clothes, and concerns about the alternative route being poor and unsafe. However, this is a flatted development, and occupiers of first-floor, self-contained accommodation would reasonably expect a different relationship with private garden space than that associated with a ground-floor flat or a single dwelling. Such arrangements typically involve a degree of separation from private garden areas, and this does not justify development that results in unacceptable harm to neighbouring occupiers.
11. The presence of a trampoline in a neighbouring garden is not comparable to an external staircase and landing, which materially increase opportunities for overlooking. I also observed a staircase to the first-floor of a property opposite the appeal site. However, I do not know whether that structure benefits from planning permission and, in any event, its relationship with neighbouring properties differs materially from the appeal scheme. These examples do not alter my findings, which are based on the particular circumstances of the appeal development.
12. I have noted the familial relationship between the occupiers of flats 18a and 18b, and their support for the scheme. However, personal circumstances are inherently changeable. While the current occupiers of the ground-floor flat may find the arrangement acceptable, there is no assurance that future occupiers would. In this case, the personal circumstances do not justify development that gives rise to long-term planning harm.

13. For these reasons, I conclude that the development causes unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. It conflicts with the amenity objectives of Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan, and with the guidance in the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to preventing or minimising overlooking.

Other Matters

14. I have taken into account the personal circumstances of the occupiers of flat 18a, in particular the requirement for the development to meet the family's needs. The Human Rights Act 1998 enshrines into UK law most of the fundamental rights contained in the European Convention on Human Rights, including Article 8 which concerns the right to private and family life and the home to be respected, which encompasses the 'best interests of the child', together with Article 1 of the First Protocol relating to the protection of property. However, those rights are qualified rights and interference in them may be considered necessary if it relates to the regulation of land use through development control measures, which is recognised as an important function of Government.

15. While I understand the occupiers' situation, the staircase represents a permanent addition that causes long-term harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. There is no substantial evidence before me that refusal of permission would prevent the family from continuing to occupy the property. Although the development may offer benefits to the occupiers, these do not outweigh the significant harm identified. I therefore find it proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.

16. I have noted the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the planning application. However, such procedural matters fall outside the scope of this appeal, which must be determined solely on its planning merits.

Conclusion

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

18. 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



Appeal Decision

By **A L McCooey BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 19/12/2025

Appeal references: CAS-04637-V8M2B5

Site address: 215 West Road, Nottage, Porthcawl, CF36 3RT

- 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 Chris Edmunds against the decision made by Bridgend County Borough Council (the LPA).
- The application Ref P/25/438/FUL, dated 15 July 2025, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2025.
- The development proposed is Removal of existing roof, create a new pitched roof to accommodate first floor living space; full reconfiguration of ground floor layouts; thermally upgrade existing envelope and associated works.
- A site visit was made by the Inspector on 16 December 2025

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted subject to the conditions set out in the Annex below.

Background and Procedural Matters

2. The appellant's name is Mr Edmunds on the planning application form and so I have used that spelling. I note that the east and west elevations on the existing and proposed plans have been labelled the wrong way round. The west elevation is the front of the property (labelled east on the plans) and the rear should be labelled east elevation not west. As it is clear which elevation is which I have assessed the proposal on this basis.
3. The officer's report refers to conflict with Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (the LDP) in relation to Policy SP3 criterion (k) and Policy SP5. It is clear from the context that these are typographical errors. The Council relies on Policy SP3: Good Design and Sustainable Placemaking and Supplementary Planning Guidance 02: Householder Development (SPG02) in its refusal of the proposal.

Reasons

4. The site is within the settlement limits of Porthcawl. The property is a bungalow and garage, set back behind a mature hedgerow. The extension would increase the height of the bungalow by around 2.4m thereby providing an additional storey on the existing footprint. All existing walls are proposed to be re-clad to match the extension. There is a variety of different designs of dwellings nearby and in the wider area. The dwellings close to the appeal site consist of detached houses and there are several dwellings of a modern design. Most dwellings are also set back in their plots with walls or hedges in front.

5. The bungalow is unremarkable with no design features of note. The front elevation is dominated by poor quality glazing. The walls are finished in a pebble dash or spa render. The dwelling appears dilapidated with no existing features worthy of retention or replication. In applying the advice in SPG02 that the design and materials of extensions should match the existing dwelling, the nature of the development should be taken into account. The proposal involves a complete re-modelling of the dwelling including replacing the existing finishes with new so that they all match. I do not consider that the proposed materials would be too conspicuous. The colours of the external finishes to be used can be controlled by condition. I note the benefits in terms of modernising the dwelling and improvements to energy efficiency as a result of the proposed cladding.
6. A recessed balcony with a large area of glazing behind at first floor level is proposed to the front elevation. The use of areas of glazing and balconies is widespread in Porthcawl. There are several dwellings with similar balconies to that proposed in close proximity to the appeal property. There are two large existing chimneys to be replaced by one on the side of the dwelling. I consider the use of these design features to be acceptable in the context of the design of the existing dwelling and the presence of similar features in the area.
7. The LPA considers that the proposal would not reflect the character of the surrounding residential area or the host property. All that is referred to by way of criticism are the above features. I noted during my site visit that there is considerable variety in the design of dwellings along West Road, which ranges from the modern with the use of glazing and balconies and some older style properties. Gables facing the road (some with balconies), dormers and large windows are common. There is a modern style dwelling two doors down from the appeal site and an ultra-modern bungalow opposite the site, that is set back from the road. The latter was approved in 2015 as a large extension to a modest bungalow. The prevailing character is of a wide variety of architectural styles typical of a coastal town. In this context, the design of the appeal proposal and the proposed materials are acceptable and would not have an adverse effect on the character of the area.
8. There are no concerns in relation to impacts on adjoining residents as a result of the proposal. Given the scale of the development and limited biodiversity value of the site, the provision of a birdbox would constitute a reasonable biodiversity enhancement.

Conclusion

9. A proposal must be assessed on its merits. The attempt to portray the existing dwelling as exhibiting traditional character worthy of protection is not warranted in this case. Having taken all the evidence into account, I conclude, for the reasons given, that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy SP3 and the placemaking principles in Planning Policy Wales. Having considered all the evidence, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed for the reasons given above.
10. In reaching my decisions, 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 the decisions are in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives.

A L McCooey

INSPECTOR

Conditions

- 1) The development shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
Reason: To comply with 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, Drawing No. PL-01, Revision PO and Drawing No. PL-02, Revision P2
Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans submitted with the application.
- 3) Prior to the construction of the extension hereby approved details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interests of good design and to accord with Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).
- 4) Prior to the first beneficial use of the development hereby permitted, an artificial nesting site for birds shall be erected on the dwelling to one of 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. Entrance holes: 32mm diameter Dimensions: H310 x W370 x D185mm or Swift Nest Box Specification: Wide box with small slit shaped entrance hole. Must be placed under or close to roofs, at least 5m from the ground. Dimensions: H150 x W340 x D150mm.
Reason: In the interest of enhancing biodiversity and to accord with Policies SP3 and DPN6 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

Appeal Decision

by G Hall BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 16.01.2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04660-T5L2J8

Site address: 1 High Street, Laleston, Bridgend, CF32 0LD

- 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 Leighton James against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/25/525/FUL, dated 28 August 2025, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2025.
- The development proposed is Detached triple garage to front garden.
- A site visit was made on 8 January 2026.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development set out in the decision notice and appeal form, as these more accurately describe the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large, detached dwelling with a large front garden on the main road through Laleston, within a predominantly residential area. A well-established front boundary hedge sits above a low wall, and neighbouring properties, including the dwelling to the west, similarly feature mature boundary hedging. This part of Laleston is characterised by a spacious layout, with dwellings set well back from the highway and front gardens that contribute to an open streetscape and a clearly defined building line.
5. The proposal is for a triple garage positioned forward of the principal elevation, close to the front boundary wall and hedge, with a mono-pitched roof. A previous appeal at the site (ref. CAS-02346-D9Y3L9) was dismissed in 2023, when the Inspector found that the proposed double garage's height, expansive roof and bulky proportions would dominate the part of the site and relate poorly to surrounding garden spaces. The appellant has sought to address these concerns by reorienting the proposed garage to run parallel with

the front boundary hedge, amending the roof design and substantially reducing the proposed maximum height.

6. Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (LDP) requires, amongst other things, that all development be appropriate to its local context. The Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) says that garages and outbuildings should not normally be in front of, or detrimentally affect the space about, the original house.
7. The revised scheme would likely reduce some of the visual impact compared with the previously dismissed proposal, due to its lower height, altered orientation and the potential for screening by the established boundary hedging. However, partial views of the garage would still be possible from certain vantage points, particularly to the east, and the proposed building would be of considerable visual bulk within the front garden, which currently contributes to the open and spacious character of the site and street. In addition, the mono-pitched roof would appear incongruous in this context, contrasting with the pitched roofs of the host and neighbouring dwellings, and would introduce an uncharacteristic feature in this prominent location.
8. Owing to its size and forward siting, the garage would disrupt the prevailing building line and erode the attractive open setting that characterises this part of the road. The introduction of a substantial outbuilding within the front garden would undermine the established pattern of development, in which open garden spaces form an important component of the streetscape, to the detriment of the area's character and appearance.
9. There is a small substation on the opposite side of the road from the appeal site. While clearly visible in the street scene, its modest scale and simple design mean it makes no meaningful contribution to the established character or appearance of the area. I am not persuaded that its presence provides material support for the appeal proposal, and I therefore attach little weight to it.
10. The appellant refers to an appeal allowing the retention of a shed at 19 Cuckoo Close, Broadlands (ref. CAS-04238-M6W3R9). Based on the information provided, the building in that case was sited to the side of the host dwelling, was significantly smaller, and was situated in a less prominent location. Appeals must be considered on their own merits, and the differences in scale, siting and context limit any direct comparison with the current proposal.
11. I conclude that, by reason of its scale, siting and design, the development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with LDP Policy SP3 and the objectives of the SPG.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
13. 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