

Appeals

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

APPEAL NO. 2045
APPLICATION NO. P/25/397
APPELLANT D2 PROPCO LIMITED
SUBJECT OF APPEAL CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING TO HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) (USE CLASS C4) MAXIMUM 4 PERSONS
LOCATION OF APPEAL 22 MACKWORTH STREET BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its location, scale and intensity, would be incompatible with the existing building and adjoining uses and would have an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity, contrary to Policies SP3, COM7 and DNP9 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

APPEAL NO. 2048
APPLICATION NO. P/25/545/FUL
APPELLANT MRS J ABSALOM
SUBJECT OF APPEAL RETENTION OF SUMMER HOUSE IN REAR GARDEN
LOCATION OF APPEAL 117 HEOL Y BARDD BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE HOUSEHOLDER
DECISION LEVEL DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed advertisement, by reason of its size, inappropriate siting and design would constitute an unduly prominent and visually obtrusive feature to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality contrary to the aims of Policy SP3 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and the aims of Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).

2. The proposed advertisement, by reason of its size, location and the changing/rotating nature of the digital display, would be detrimental to the safety of pedestrian and vehicular traffic using the adjoining highways at this busy urban junction, contrary to Policy SP5 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

APPEAL NO. 2050
APPLICATION NO. P/23/448/FUL
APPELLANT E GARFIELD
SUBJECT OF APPEAL CONVERSION OF AN EXISTING BARN INTO A 2 BED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING
LOCATION OF APPEAL CYNHORDY FARM BRYN TERRACE LLETTY BRONGU

MAESTEG
PROCEDURE WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed development is at variance with advice contained in Planning Policy Wales 12 and Policies SP5 and DNP2 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) regarding sustainability in that it is in a remote location that is not accessible by a range of different transport modes and will rely on the use of private motor vehicles.
- 2 The proposed alterations to the agricultural building, by reason of their design, form, scale and materials, represents a major remodelling of a rural building in the open countryside that is not subordinate to, or in keeping with, the original building and does not enhance its rural character and is therefore contrary to Policies SP3 and DNP1 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).
- 3 The narrow access road leading to the site is not suitable to serve the proposed residential development in terms of its constrained width when passing opposing traffic, limited forward visibility, and lack of lighting together with the absence of segregated footways. The development will generate increased traffic onto this route resulting in a potential increase in vehicular and pedestrian/vehicle conflict to the detriment of the safety and free flow of traffic contrary to Policies SP5, PLA12 and DNP2 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).
- 4 Insufficient evidence has been submitted to indicate that other suitable rural or business uses have been considered including any exercise evidencing that the building has been marketed for other alternative uses (over a minimum period of 12 months). As such the proposal is contrary to Policy DNP2 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

APPEAL NO.	2051
APPLICATION NO.	A/25/14/ADV
APPELLANT	WILDSTONE ESTATES LTD
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	PROPOSAL FOR THE ERECTION OF A FREESTANDING D48 DIGITAL 'BILLBOARD' ADVERTISING POSTER
LOCATION OF APPEAL	GRASS VERGE BETWEEN CAR WASH AND KFC LAND SOUTH OF A48 HERNSTON BUSINESS PARK BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE	COMMERCIAL APPEAL
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed advertisement, by reason of its size, inappropriate siting and design would constitute an unduly prominent and visually obtrusive feature to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality contrary to the aims of Policy SP3 of the Replacement

Local Development Plan (2024) and the aims of Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).

2. The proposed advertisement, by reason of its size, location and the changing/rotating nature of the digital display, would be detrimental to the safety of pedestrian and vehicular traffic using the adjoining highways at this busy urban junction, contrary to Policy SP5 of the Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

The following appeal has been decided 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, BRIDGEND
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 A

RECOMMENDATION

That the report of the Corporate Director Communities be noted.

**JANINE NIGHTINGALE
CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES**

Background Papers (see application reference number)



Appeal Decision

by L. Hughson-Smith LLB MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 13.02.2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04599-K0B4J2

Site address: 1 Preswylfa Court, Coychurch, Bridgend, Mid-Glamorgan, South Wales CF35 5ES

- 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. Kevin Parry against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application ref: P/25/228/FUL, dated 4 April 2025, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2025.
 - The proposed development is described as 'extending existing front porch. Taking existing front window out and knocking through to create a bigger room in lounge and take down non supporting internal wall between kitchen and lounge.'
 - A site visit was made on 29 January 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the site address as stated on the appeal form since it is more accurate.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is set back from the road within a varied streetscene, characterised by a mix of commercial and residential development, including detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings of differing styles, sizes and roof forms. Despite this variation, the appeal property is read from the street as forming part of a semi-detach pair, which have a strong sense of symmetry and uniformity due to their similar form, consistent window arrangement and matching roof design. Whilst minor alterations have been made to the appeal property, such as changes to external paint colour, window finishes and boundary treatments, the visual coherence of the pair remains intact. As such, the properties continue to be read and appreciated together as a cohesive and attractive element in the streetscene.

5. The proposed front extension would infill the space between the existing porch and shared boundary with the attached property. Its roof would align with that of the porch, the footprint would be modest, and it would be finished in materials to match the host dwelling. However, despite these design measures, the proposal would span a significant proportion of the appeal property's front elevation and, by virtue of its position, would represent a prominent addition to the host dwelling. In addition, the proposed fenestration, which includes large bi-fold doors and a glass roof, would be at odds with the existing consistent window arrangement and proportions. Consequently, the proposed extension would be an ungainly addition that would unacceptably alter the appearance of the appeal property. Furthermore, the proposal would disrupt the symmetry of the semi-detached pair, unbalancing their cohesive appearance to the detriment of the streetscene.
6. During my site visit, I observed that the bus stop to the front of the appeal property, along with the front boundary wall and fence, provides some screening to the front elevation. Nevertheless, the property remains widely visible from public vantage points. Moreover, the presence of the bus stop, which is a typical feature within residential areas, does not provide justification for the proposed development.
7. I note the examples of front extensions along Hawthorn Road depicted in the photographs submitted by the appellant, however, there is insufficient information before me to confirm if these are lawful. Regardless of this, the existence of comparable development would rarely be sufficient reason to permit something that is otherwise harmful.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area in conflict with Bridgend County Borough Council Local Development Plan Policy SP3 which requires that all development must contribute to creating high quality, attractive sustainable places including that all development must, amongst other things, have a design of the highest quality possible whilst respecting and enhancing local distinctiveness. It is also contrary to the objectives of the SPG 02 Householder Development Supplementary Planning Guidance including that front extensions should be designed to the highest standard in recognition of their prominence in the streetscene.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed
10. 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.

L. Hughson-Smith

INSPECTOR