

Appeals

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

APPEAL NO.	2068
APPLICATION NO.	A/26/2/ADV
APPELLANT	WILDSTONE ESTATES LTD
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	INSTALLATION OF DIGITAL ADVERTISEMENT HOARDING
LOCATION OF APPEAL	QUARELLA ROAD (JUNCTION WITH BOULEVARD DE VILLENAVE D'ORNON A4061) BRIDGEND CF31 1JN
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed advertisement would, by reason of its size, inappropriate siting and design, constitute an unduly prominent and visually obtrusive feature to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality including the nearby Arc Building and the Bridgend Conservation Area, contrary to the aims of Policies SP3 and SP18 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).
 2. The proposed digital sign would, by reason of its size, illumination and siting, create a distraction to highway users at a busy junction with turning movements to and from Quarella Road and Boulevard De Villenave within close proximity to pedestrian crossing facilities to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policies SP3 and SP5 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).
 3. The application submission contains insufficient details and specifications of the proposed sign in terms of its height and advertisement content to enable a full assessment of all highway safety considerations to be made.
-

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

APPEAL NO.	2042
APPLICATION NO.	P/24/218/FUL
APPELLANT	MR H YILDIZTEKIN
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	CHANGE OF USE FROM RETAIL TO FOOD TAKEAWAY WITH THE INSTALLATION OF A NEW EXTRACTION SYSTEM
LOCATION OF APPEAL	34 BRIDGE STREET KENFIG HILL
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.	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
DECISION	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE DISMISSED.

The Appeal and Costs decisions are attached as **APPENDIX B.**

APPEAL NO.	2057
APPLICATION NO.	P/26/239/FUL
APPELLANT	W VIDEAN
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	ALLEGED UNAUTHORISED BUILDING AND EXCAVATION WORKS
LOCATION OF APPEAL	23 LLAN ROAD MAESTEG
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER
DECISION	THE INSPECTOR APPOINTED BY THE WELSH MINISTERS TO DETERMINE THIS APPEAL DIRECTED THAT THE APPEAL BE DISMISSED.

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

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: 15/06/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04662-X0R0Y3

Site address: 34 Bridge Street, Kenfig Hill, Bridgend CF33 6DD

- 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. Haci Yildiztekin against the decision of the Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application P/24/218/FUL, dated 14 April 2024, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2025.
 - The proposed development is the change of use from retail to hot food takeaway with installation of an extraction system.
 - A site visit was made on 1 April 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the change of use from retail to hot food takeaway with installation of an extraction system at 34 Bridge Street, Kenfig Hill, Bridgend CF33 6DD, in accordance with the terms of the application, ref: P/24/218/FUL, dated 14 April 2024, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision letter.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs has been made by Mr. Haci Yildiztekin against Bridgend County Borough Council. This application is subject to a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The name of the appellant, as stated on the appeal form, differs to that on the original application form. As the right to appeal is reserved solely for the original applicant, the appeal will proceed in the name of the applicant as stated on the original application form.
4. I have taken the description of development from the appeal form since it is more accurate.

Main Issue

5. This is the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with particular regard to parking provision and the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises an existing commercial unit on Bridge Street, near a four-way signalised junction. It is located within a District Centre, as defined by Policy SP12 of the Bridgend County Borough Council Local Development Plan (LDP), where the surrounding area is characterised by a mix of commercial and residential uses, including a convenience store and a hot food takeaway nearby. During my site visit, albeit a snapshot in time, I observed that Bridge Street functions as a busy through route with a regular flow of traffic, including buses, and consistent pedestrian activity.
7. The carriageway immediately outside the appeal site is subject to double yellow line restrictions. There is short-stay on-street parking on Bridge Street opposite the site, limited to 30 minutes between 8am and 6pm. I observed that parking in these spaces, as well as at the nearby bus stop, can reduce the effective width of the carriageway, although this did not appear to significantly impede the free flow of traffic.
8. LDP Policy SP3 states that all development must contribute to creating high quality, attractive, sustainable places that support active and healthy lives, including maximising opportunities for active travel and increasing public transport. LDP Policy PLA11 requires development to be served by appropriate levels of parking in accordance with the adopted SPG on parking standards.
9. The proposal does not provide any off-street parking or servicing area. However, Supplementary Planning Guidance Parking Standards SPG17 (SPG 17) sets out maximum parking standards for hot food takeaways and Note 6 of Supplementary Planning Guidance Hot Food Takeaway Establishments SPG 14 (SPG14) advises that, within district centres, on-street parking provision will be acceptable provided it would not infringe existing access or waiting restrictions. This approach is consistent with Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12) (PPW) which emphasises that parking standards should be expressed as maxima and that parking provision should be informed by the local context, including public transport accessibility, urban design principles and the objective of reducing reliance on the private car and supporting a modal shift to walking, cycling and public transport.
10. There is some disagreement as to whether the existing use is a laundrette or dry cleaners. Regardless, the proposed hot food takeaway would have different parking and traffic characteristics to both these uses, likely generating shorter visits and a higher turnover of customers, particularly at peak times. However, an increase in short-stay trips does not, in itself, demonstrate an unacceptable impact on highway safety or traffic flow.
11. The Council contends that customers and delivery drivers would park on the double yellow lines outside the site, causing obstruction near the signalised junction which would cause harm to highway safety. However, there is no substantive evidence, such as photographs or parking surveys, to indicate that such behaviour is likely, nor that existing nearby commercial uses, including the nearby takeaway, give rise to indiscriminate parking, disruption to traffic flow or effects the operation of the nearby junction. Whilst reference is made to one serious personal injury collision and another slight collision, limited information about their causes has been provided, and their relevance to the appeal proposal is therefore unclear. In any event, two incidents at different locations over a period of around five years do not indicate an established pattern of accidents in the vicinity of the appeal site.
12. The site lies within a District Centre where short-stay commercial activity is an established feature of the local highway environment. The 30-minute parking bays opposite are intended to serve such uses during daytime hours, consistent with my observations of regular vehicle turnover associated with nearby businesses, particularly the convenience

store opposite the appeal property. Although my site visit did not capture peak trading periods or the operation of a hot food takeaway, it nevertheless provided an indication of how short-stay parking demand is accommodated along this part of Bridge Street. Despite the presence of parking and waiting restrictions near the junction, I did not observe indiscriminate parking, obstruction, or disruption to traffic flow.

13. Furthermore, I have not been provided with cogent evidence to demonstrate that existing short-stay parking provision is insufficient, or that it would be unable to accommodate the likely demand arising from the proposed development. Based on my observations, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I consider the likely travel patterns associated with the proposed use would be consistent with the existing local highway environment and I am satisfied that reliance on nearby on-street parking would be appropriate.
14. Notwithstanding this, the appeal site is also in a sustainable location. It lies within an established District Centre, close to other shops and services, with a bus stop nearby on Bridge Street and the surrounding residential streets are within walking distance. There is, therefore, a realistic prospect that some trips would be made on foot, by public transport, or part of linked trips to other nearby shops and services.
15. It is likely the proposal would involve regular stock deliveries, in addition to customer and other delivery activity. However, stock deliveries could be managed to avoid peak operational periods through a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan, including delivery times and arrangements, which could reasonably be secured by planning condition.
16. Customer delivery activity is likely to be more frequent and less predictable than stock deliveries, particularly in the evening when residential parking demand is at its highest and the 30-minute on-street parking restrictions no longer apply. Whilst delivery drivers may operate to tight schedules, collections would generally be short-stay in nature and, in the absence of substantive evidence to the contrary, I am not persuaded that the availability of nearby on-street parking in the evening would be so constrained that drivers would be likely to park indiscriminately on the double yellow lines outside the appeal site, obstruct the highway, or require enforcement action by civil enforcement officers or the police.
17. It is also common for delivery drivers to collect multiple orders at once during busier periods, potentially reducing overall trip generation. Whilst bicycles, e-bikes or e-scooters are unlikely to be the primary mode of transport used by delivery drivers; there is no substantive evidence to suggest they are not a realistic option for at least some deliveries in the local catchment.
18. Drawing these matters together, I find that while the proposal would alter patterns of customer and delivery activity, it would do so within the context of an established District Centre characterised by short-stay parking and commercial turnover. Given the availability of nearby on-street parking, the site's accessible location, and the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, I am not persuaded that the proposal would give rise to indiscriminate parking, obstruction, unsafe manoeuvres, or harm to the free flow of traffic or operation of the nearby junction. I, therefore, conclude the proposal would not have a harmful impact on highway safety with particular regard to parking provision and the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site. This is in accordance with LDP Policy SP3 and LDP Policy PLA11 and would comply with the aims of SPG14 and SPG17. It would also align with the objectives of PPW.
19. The Council also refers to LDP policy SP17 in its decision notice. However, as this relates to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment, it is not directly applicable in this instance, and I find no conflict with it.

Other Matters

20. I acknowledge the concerns raised by local residents and Pyle Community Council regarding noise and disturbance, including the proximity to residential properties, potential congregation outside the premises, and the operation of extraction equipment. However, the appeal site is situated within a mixed residential and commercial area on a busy road where activity levels are inherently higher than in predominantly residential settings, and in that context, I am not persuaded that any additional noise or disturbance would be so noticeable as to result in material harm. Moreover, conditions have been imposed to control noise from the extraction system and to manage odour, and I note that the Shared Regulatory Service (SRS) raises no objection. There is also no substantive evidence before me to suggest the proposal would result in poor waste management practices or contribute to unhealthy eating habits.

Conditions

21. I have amended the wording of some of the Council's suggested conditions in the interests of conciseness. Given my findings above, it is not necessary for the Delivery and Servicing Management Plan to include a management protocol for third-party delivery drivers. In any event, I do not consider such a protocol would be enforceable since it would be difficult to ascertain what vehicles are associated with the proposed use rather than other similar uses in the vicinity. The Council proposed more restrictive hours of operation than those advised by the SRS to limit potential late evening parking conflict during periods of peak residential demand. However, I do not consider this necessary in light of my findings above and have instead imposed a condition reflecting the longer hours recommended by the SRS. A condition is also required to secure biodiversity enhancements proportionate to the scale and nature of the development, in accordance with Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12), which affords significant weight to the absence of such measures.

Conclusion

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

23. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards the Welsh Ministers' well-being objective to make our cities, towns and villages even better places in which to live and work.

L. Hughson-Smith

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. The development shall begin no later than five years from the date of this decision.
Reason: To comply with the requirements 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

- BRI-02 REV 1.2 EXISTING AND PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN
- BRI-03 REV 1.2 EXISTING AND PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN
- BRI-04 REV 1.2 EXISTING AND PROPOSED LOFT FLOOR PLAN
- BRI-05 REV 1.2 EXISTING AND PROPOSED ROOF PLAN
- BRI-08 REV 1.2 EXISTING AND PROPOSED SECTION A-A
- BRI-09 REV 1.2 EXISTING AND PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION
- BRI-10 REV 1.2 EXISTING AND PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION
- BRI-11 REV 1.2 EXISTING AND PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION
- PROPOSED CANOPY AND DUCTING INSTALLATION SPECIFICATION, dated 17.10.2024
- SPECIFICATION & EMAQ REPORT dated 17.10.24

Reason: In the interests of clarity and to ensure the development complies with the submitted plans and documents on which this decision was based.

3. No use of the premises as a hot food takeaway shall commence until a Delivery and Servicing Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan shall include details of the frequency and timing of commercial supply deliveries and measures to ensure that delivery and service vehicles do not stop within the 25 metre no waiting/no loading restriction adjacent to the signalised junction. The proposed hot food takeaway shall operate strictly in accordance with the approved Delivery and Servicing Management Plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to prevent obstruction of the junction envelope in accordance with Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

4. No use of the premises as a hot food takeaway shall commence until the extraction system and mitigation for the control of odour and noise has been installed in accordance with the approved details, including the document supplied by KADERFAB entitled 'Proposed canopy and ducting installation specification' Date: 17.10.2024 and 'Purified Air entitled: Specification & EMAQ Report' dated 17.10.24 and the approved drawings listed in Condition 2 of this planning permission. The extraction system and mitigation for the control of odour and noise shall be maintained and retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the amenities of the area in accordance with Policy SP3 and DNP9 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

5. The use hereby permitted shall not operate outside the hours of 11:00 to 23:00 Sunday to Thursday and 11:00 to 23:30 Fridays and Saturdays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

6. The rating level of the noise from the extraction system shall not exceed 38dBA as measured (or where this is not possible a combination of measurement and calculation) at any existing residential premises at the time of the grant of planning permission when assessed in accordance with BS4142:2014.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Policy SP3 and DNP9 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

7. The ground floor of the premises shall be used as a takeaway (Class A3 Use only), and for no other purpose including any other purpose in Class A3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenities in accordance with Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

8. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme of biodiversity enhancements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The biodiversity enhancement scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans prior to the first beneficial use of the development hereby approved and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interest of protected species, in accordance with Policy 9 of Future Wales.



Appeal Decision

by L. Hughson-Smith LLB MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 02/07/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04855-M9K4F7

Site address: Cynhordy Farm, Bryn Terrace, Lletty Brongu, Maesteg CF34 0EA

- 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 Eiryl Garfield against the decision of the Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application P/23/448/FUL, dated 10 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2025.
 - The proposed development is to 'convert an existing barn into a 2 bed residential dwelling for the applicant. The barn is a stone built structure with a pitched roof and dates back to early 1920's. The development will retain the size, scale and nature of the existing structure, whilst modernising the thermal performance and natural lighting features to produce an energy efficient dwelling. See enclosed Design Access Statement for more details'.
 - A site visit was made on 17 April 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development as stated on the appeal form indicates the proposed dwelling is for a retired agricultural worker. However, this did not form part of the original application, including the description of development, and limited evidence in this regard has been provided. As the appeal process cannot be used to evolve a scheme, I have determined the appeal based on the proposal and information considered by the Council.

Main Issues

3. These are:
 - a. Whether the proposed development is justified in its countryside location having regard to local and national planning policy; and
 - b. The effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

Countryside Location

4. The appeal site comprises a cluster of agricultural buildings at Cynhordy Farm, located in an isolated rural location, defined as open countryside by the Bridgend Local Development Plan (LDP), with the nearest settlement, Llangynwyd, around 1km away. The surrounding area has a distinctly rural character, comprising agricultural land interspersed with individual farmsteads and dwellings. The appeal site occupies an elevated position within the landscape and, whilst it benefits from some screening by existing features, it remains visible in wider views. As a result, the buildings are experienced as part of an attractive, open rural setting.
5. The proposal involves the conversion of an existing stone barn to a two-bed dwelling, including the removal and replacement of the existing blockwork lean-to structure with a two-storey extension. The proposal also includes the removal of the stone barn's small porch as well as the metal-clad Dutch hay barn and its attached lean-to store.
6. Based on the proposed plans, I am satisfied the scheme represents the conversion and extension of a rural building. Therefore, LDP Policy DNP1 applies which seeks to protect the integrity of the countryside and prevent inappropriate forms of development. It contains a presumption against development outside settlement boundaries, subject to specified exceptions. One such exception is the suitable conversion of, and limited extension to, existing structurally sound rural buildings where the development is modest in scale and clearly subordinate to the original structure. LDP Policy DNP2 also applies which sets out criteria for the conversion or renovation of rural buildings.
7. These policies are in general accord with Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12) (PPW) which strictly controls development in the countryside and advises that such development should be located within and adjoining those settlements where it can best be accommodated in terms of infrastructure and access, and should be of a design that respects the character of the surrounding area.
8. I acknowledge the proposal, due to the removal of existing structures, would result in a smaller overall footprint of built form compared to the existing situation. I also note that the proposed two storey extension would be lower in height than the existing Dutch barn. Nevertheless, the existing buildings, including the Dutch barn, have a simple agricultural appearance and are read as part of the rural character of the site and wider landscape.
9. In contrast, the proposed two-storey extension would replace a simple single-storey structure with a materially taller form that would rise above the ridge of the retained stone barn. Its increased height, narrower proportions and steeper roof pitch, compared to the retained barn, would give it a noticeably more domestic character and create an awkward and unbalanced relationship between the two elements. Rather than appearing limited and sympathetic, the extension would represent a substantial addition that would dominate the retained stone barn. Although the proposal includes the use of stone and incorporates the original trusses, this would not overcome the fundamental concerns regarding the overall development's scale, form and domestic character.
10. The domesticating effect would be compounded by the proposed fenestration. While the retained stone barn contains some existing openings, these are limited and reflect its simple agricultural character. The proposal would introduce substantial glazing to the southern elevation of the stone barn, together with numerous wide glazed openings to the front elevation of the proposed extension and several rooflights. Taken together, these additions would add to the domestic appearance of the scheme, would further erode the simple appearance and agricultural character of the appeal site and fail to satisfactorily

integrate into the surrounding rural landscape. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with LDP Policy DNP2 criterion 2) and LDP Policy SP3 which requires, amongst other things, all development to be appropriate to its local context including in terms of size, scale, height, massing, elevational treatment, materials and detailing.

11. The appellant refers to other dwellings in the local area which are said to have a greater impact on the landscape than the proposal. However, insufficient detail, such as specific addresses or planning histories, has been provided to allow a meaningful comparison. I have considered the planning permission for the Old House, Llangynwyd Village (ref: P/16/1003/FUL). This relates to the renovation and remodelling of a listed public house and associated outbuildings, along with the construction of an extension within the defined settlement boundary of Llangynwyd and was considered under the previous LDP. Given these differences in context and policy background, it is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. I have, therefore, determined the appeal on its own merits.
12. For residential conversions, LDP Policy DNP2 (criterion a) also requires evidence that the building has been appropriately marketed for alternative uses, such as farm diversification, business, community, tourism or recreational uses, and that such alternative uses are not viable, and the advice contained in Technical Advice Note 6: Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities does not negate this requirement. I acknowledge the building lacks mains services, including electricity, water, sewerage and telecommunication. However, no detailed viability evidence, costed service information, marketing evidence, or other substantive assessment of alternative uses has been provided to demonstrate such alternative uses are not viable. Consequently, I am not satisfied that the requirements of Policy DNP2 in this respect have been met.
13. Turning to the sustainability of the location, the appellant states that Llangynwyd can be reached via a public bridleway/footpath which would reduce the need to travel by car. However, there is limited evidence to indicate the specified route is lit, surfaced, has dedicated pedestrian infrastructure, or would otherwise provide a convenient and practical everyday means of accessing services, public transport and community facilities, particularly in poor weather or during the hours of darkness.
14. Whilst the route may offer some opportunity for walking, I am not persuaded it would make the appeal site accessible for day-to-day needs. Future occupiers would, therefore, be likely to rely heavily on the private car. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with criterion b) of LDP Policy DNP2 and with LDP Policy SP5 which, amongst other things, seeks to minimise the need to travel, reduce dependency on the private car and enable sustainable access to employment, education, local services and community facilities.
15. Drawing the above together, the proposal fails to satisfy all the relevant criteria of LDP Policy DNP2 and, therefore, would not satisfy the exception requirements of LDP Policies DNP1. It would introduce an unjustified open market dwelling in the countryside, in a location where future occupiers would be likely to rely heavily on private motor vehicles, and through works which would fail to retain and respect the rural character of the existing agricultural building and surrounding landscape. The proposal would therefore conflict with LDP Policies DNP1, DNP2, SP3 and SP5, and with the objectives of Planning Policy Wales.

Highway Safety

16. LDP Policy SP5 which requires all development, amongst other things, to provide safe and efficient access to the transport network, and LDP Policy PLA12 states that all development must provide permeable, legible, direct, convenient, attractive and safe walking routes, as well as other things. One of the criteria of LDP Policy DNP2 is that

proposals for the conversion of rural buildings provide safe access for pedestrians and vehicles.

17. The appeal site is accessed from Bryn Terrace via an unadopted rural lane. I observed that the lane is narrow in places with restricted forward visibility at certain points, lacks a segregated footway and street lighting, and that opposing vehicles may need to slow, manoeuvre or make use of informal passing places. However, such characteristics are typical of rural lanes, where drivers are expected to proceed with appropriate caution. Therefore, in this context, these limitations do not, in themselves, indicate that the access is unsafe or incapable of accommodating the level of traffic likely to arise from the proposal.
18. The proposed two-bedroom dwelling is anticipated to generate approximately 6 to 8 vehicle movements per day. This represents a modest increase and would be unlikely to materially alter existing traffic conditions, particularly as the evidence indicates that the lane already serves a small number of dwellings as well as agricultural activity. Moreover, no substantive evidence is presented which demonstrates existing highway safety issues attributable to the current conditions or use of the lane, such as accident records, or that the development would materially worsen existing conditions.
19. The absence of lighting and a formal footway may reduce the attractiveness and convenience of the route for pedestrian, particularly during hours of darkness or inclement weather. However, as per my findings above, it is reasonable to expect that future occupants would predominantly rely on private vehicles for day-to-day travel. As such, pedestrian activity associated with the proposal is likely to be limited. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the development would give rise to a material increase in the risk of conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.
20. The appellant has drawn my attention to a permanent permission for holiday accommodation nearby (ref: P/16/508/RLX, formerly a temporary permission under application ref: P/11/282/FUL). However, I do not consider this development to be directly comparable to the proposal before me given it is for a different use and was determined under a different planning policy regime. Regardless of this, I am satisfied for the reasons given above that the level of traffic likely to be generated would be modest and would not give rise to unacceptable highway safety impacts or affect the safe operation of the lane. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on highway safety and would accord with the requirements of LDP Policies SP5, PLA12 or DNP2.

Other Matters

21. I am aware the proposed dwelling is needed to provide accommodation for elderly relatives and, whilst not planning policy, I note the Age Friendly Community Principles and National Strategy for Older People in Wales. I am also aware no local resident objections to the application were received. However, limited information has been provided regarding the relative's current circumstances, their specific accommodation and/or care needs, why those needs must be met at the appeal site, or what consequences would arise if the appeal was dismissed.
22. Notwithstanding that, there is no cogent evidence which persuades me that the scheme as designed represents the only viable means of meeting the appellant's needs. Nevertheless, I accept that the scheme would provide some benefits to the appellant, based on the evidence presented. However, I do not consider they would outweigh the significant harm I have identified in relation to the first main issue. Accordingly, I find that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.

23. I note the other benefits of the proposal as cited by the appellant including the re-use and long-term retention of an existing rural building, the likely efficient energy performance of the development and the provision of a high-quality residential unit. However, given the scale and nature of the proposal, the scope of these benefits would be limited and do not outweigh the policy conflict identified above in relation to the first main issue. There is also no substantive evidence that dismissing the appeal would have an adverse impact on the Welsh language.

Conclusion

24. I have found that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway safety, however the conflict with local and national planning policies is significant and a compelling factor that has led to my decision. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

25. 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



Costs Decision

by L. Hughson-Smith LLB MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 02/07/2026

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: CAS-04855-M9K4F7

Site address: Cynhordy Farm, Bryn Terrace, Lletty Brongu, Maesteg CF34 0EA

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322C and Schedule 6.
 - The application is made by Eiryl Garfield for a full award of costs against Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for 'the proposal is to convert an existing barn into a 2 bed residential dwelling for the applicant. The barn is a stone built structure with a pitched roof and dates back to early 1920's. The development will retain the size, scale and nature of the existing structure, whilst modernising the thermal performance and natural lighting features to produce an energy efficient dwelling. See enclosed Design Access Statement for more details'.
 - A site visit was made on 17 April 2026.
-

Decision

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

Reasons

2. The Section 12 Annex 'Award of Costs' of the Development Management Manual ('the Annex') advises that, irrespective of the outcome of an appeal, costs may only be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably, and that such behaviour has caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. Whilst I note the applicant's concerns regarding the Local Planning Authority's lack of communication and collaboration during the planning application process, the LPA is not obligated to negotiate or provide advice to applicants on alternative proposals when dealing with applications. Nevertheless, the evidence of correspondence before me indicates that some engagement between the LPA and applicant occurred during the life of the application, including the LPA providing an overview of its concerns with the proposal in an email dated 20 March 2025. I do not, therefore, find the LPA acted unreasonably in this regard.
4. The Officer's Report does not fully address the public bridleway/footpath as an alternative walking route to the nearest settlement, or the other developments referred to by the applicant, including planning approvals ref: P/16/1003/FUL and P/16/508/RLX. However,

these matters were addressed adequately in the LPA's Statement of Case for the appeal and, as set out in the main decision I did not find the public bridleway/footpath to be a realistic walking route, nor did I find the cited planning approvals to be comparable to the appeal proposal. As such, I am not persuaded that the lack of detail on these matters within the Officer's Report amounts to unreasonable behaviour.

5. The applicant also contends that the LPA acted unreasonably in requesting structural and ecology information, given that the application was ultimately refused. Bridgend Local Development Plan Policy DMP2 requires rural buildings to be structurally suitable for conversion, it was therefore reasonable for the LPA to seek structural evidence. Similarly, given the proposal involved the conversion of a stone barn in the countryside, it was reasonable to request bat information, particularly given the barn was subsequently found to hold a small roost for bats. The application subsequently being refused does not make those requests unreasonable, as the information was necessary to properly assess the proposal.
6. There were significant delays in determining the application, well beyond the statutory time limits. I note that some delay was caused by the submission of ecology information after the application had been submitted. However, once this information was submitted, the application still took over a year to determine. Aside from workload pressures, there is limited substantive evidence before me to explain the extent of the delay, particularly given that the application was recommended for refusal on the 17th of July 2025, as stated in Table 1: Correspondence Timetable contained in the LPAs Response to Application for Costs Statement, yet the decision notice was not issued for around another 3 months. On the evidence before me, I find that the LPA acted unreasonably in delaying the determination of the application.
7. However, in order for costs to be awarded, the LPA's unreasonable behaviour must also have caused the applicant to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. Despite my finding that the LPA acted unreasonably in delaying the determination of the application, I found the council's reason for refusal in relation to the first main issue as set out in the main decision to be well founded. Therefore, this substantive matter in dispute between the parties could have only been addressed through an appeal. As the appeal could not have been avoided, I am not satisfied that unnecessary or wasted expense has been incurred because of the LPA's unreasonable behaviour.
8. For the reasons set out above, the application for the award of costs is refused.

L. Hughson-Smith

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date of decisions: 07/07/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04950-D1L4K3

Site address: Land at 23 Llan Road, Cwmfelin, Maesteg CF34 9HN

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
 - The appeal is made by Warren Videan against an enforcement notice issued by Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The Enforcement Notice, numbered ENF/314/24/AC was issued on 16 February 2026.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is 'Without planning permission the change of use of part of the land from a field to a parking area to serve 23 Llan Road, Cwmfelin by (i) the provision of a retaining wall ("**retaining wall**") located to the East of the garage on the land as shown in the approximate position by a blue line on the attached plan and (ii) a hardstanding area ("**hardstanding area**").
 - The requirements of the notice are: (a) Remove the retaining wall in its entirety (together with all resulting materials from the land); b) remove in their entirety all the aggregate materials that form the Hardstanding Area from the Land; c) Re-grade the Hardstanding Area and reinstate the slope on the Land to accord with the details in the attached Plan 402 dated 15 October 2024; and d) Seed the whole area previously covered by the Hardstanding Area and the Retaining Wall with grass.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is by the expiry of Three (3) months after the date on which this Notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
 - A site visit was made on 22 May 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and the Enforcement Notice is upheld.

Reasons

2. An appeal under ground (g) is that the time given to comply with the requirements of the Enforcement Notice is too short. In this case the period for compliance is three months.
3. The unauthorised works were carried out with the intention of complying with a condition on a planning permission for extensions and alterations to the existing house, 23 Llan Road. This required that parking space be provided for the approved development. A

subsequent planning application (Ref P/25/342/FUL) to regularise the unauthorised works was refused on 9 October 2025. In their grounds of appeal, the appellant states an intention to submit a pre-application enquiry to the Council to seek a solution to regularise these works via a full application. At the same time, it is claimed that the appellant used the site as a garden for many years and will seek to regularise this through the submission of an application for a Lawful Development Certificate for an Existing Use or Operation or Activity. The appellant is therefore seeking an extended period of compliance to allow time for a formal application to be prepared.

4. I have not been made aware of any progress with an application, and despite the appellant's assurances that these matters will be resolved, there is no certainty that planning permission will be forthcoming or that lawfulness of any change of use will be established. Nonetheless, the Council would have the discretion to delay actively pursuing the requirements of the Notice if it is satisfied that suitable progress is being made. Indeed, this course of action is acknowledged by the Council in this case. Bearing in mind that planning permission for the unauthorised works was refused some time ago and that a period of time has elapsed since enforcement proceedings were commenced, I find that extending the period of compliance would further prolong the identified public harm without justification.
5. I find that the specified period of compliance reasonably balances the competing private and public interests. As such, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Conclusions

6. For the above reasons, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed, and the Enforcement Notice upheld.
7. 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.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR