

Appeals

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

APPEAL NO.	2052
APPLICATION NO.	P/25/483/FUL
APPELLANT	MR C RICHARDS
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	RETAIN EXISTING STONE BARN WALLING, REMOVE FLOORS AND ROOF OF STONE BARN; FORM INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND LARGE STRUCTURAL OPENINGS TO EXISTING STONE WALL (ALL STONE TO BE REUSED); RAISE EXISTING STONE WALL TO ACCOMMODATE NEW MONO PITCHED ROOF SET AT A HIGHER LEVEL TO ENSURE ADEQUATE FLOOR TO CEILING HEIGHTS OVER TWO FLOORS; ERECTION OF TWO STOREY EXTENSION; PROVISION OF TWO PARKING SPACES; PATHWAY TO LOWER PLATEAU AND REAR GARDEN (WORKS TO SUPPORT CHANGE OF USE TO SINGLE RESIDENTIAL UNIT)
LOCATION OF APPEAL	BARN AND LAND AT MILL LANE BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in an unacceptable intensification of the use of Mill Lane, a narrow, steep and unlit access with no pedestrian facilities or passing provision, to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety contrary to the provisions of policies SP3 and SP5 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).
2. The constrained junction with Tondu Road fails to provide adequate visibility, particularly to the north where the submitted drawing applies a 30-mph visibility standard to a section partly within a 50-mph speed-limit zone, to the detriment of highway 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 resulting increase in the probability of vehicular and pedestrian conflicts, reversing movements and an overreliance on private transport would be detrimental to highway 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), TAN 18 and the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013.

APPEAL NO.	2053
APPLICATION NO.	P/25/410/FUL
APPELLANT	MS R WILLIAMS

SUBJECT OF APPEAL	HARD LANDSCAPING OF THE FRONT GARDEN OF THE PROPERTY TO PROVIDE 2NO. OFF ROAD PARKING SPACES AND ASSOCIATED ENGINEERING WORKS INCLUDING DROPPED KERBS
LOCATION OF APPEAL	38 BRYNLLYWARCH MAESTEG
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its design, layout, form and scale, represents an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development which is out of keeping with, and harmful to, the established character and appearance of the prevailing built up residential area and streetscene contrary to Policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024) and advice contained within Planning Policy 12 (Feb. 2024).
2. The proposed development, by reason its design, form and siting, will result in the loss of on-street parking availability to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to Policies SP5 and PLA11 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan, Note 9 of Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02: Householder Development and advice contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 17: Parking Standards.
3. The proposed development, by reason if its design, form and siting, is adjacent to a narrow road that is not suitable for reversing manoeuvres from what will become the principal means of vehicular access for the host property, contrary to Policies SP5 and PLA11 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan, Note 9 of Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 02: Householder Development and advice contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 17: Parking Standards.
4. The proposal fails to demonstrate a sufficient biodiversity net gain as part of the scheme, contrary to Policies DNP6 and DNP8 of the Bridgend County Borough Replacement Local Development Plan (2018-2033) and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales 12 (Feb. 2024).

APPEAL NO.	2062
ENF NO.	ENF/42/25/ACK
APPELLANT	MR K TODD
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	ALLEGED UNAUTHORISED CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FOR GARDEN PURPOSES
LOCATION OF APPEAL	LAND ADJ 32 PEN LLWYN BROADLANDS BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

APPEAL NO.	2064
ENF NO.	ENF/16/24/ANC
APPELLANT	M SMART

SUBJECT OF APPEAL	ALLEGED NON-COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS OF PLANNING PERMISSION P/22/337/FUL & /P/22/335/FUL IN REGARD TO GROUND LEVELS, POSITION OF BUILDING AND BOUNDARY WALLS.
LOCATION OF APPEAL	26 PANT GLAS PENCOED
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

APPEAL NO.	2065
ENF NO.	ENF/16/24/ANC
APPELLANT	M SMART
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	ALLEGED NON-COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS OF PLANNING PERMISSION P/22/337/FUL & /P/22/335/FUL IN REGARD TO GROUND LEVELS, POSITION OF BUILDING AND BOUNDARY WALLS.
LOCATION OF APPEAL	28 PANT GLAS PENCOED
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

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

APPEAL NO.	2049
APPLICATION NO.	P/24/514/FUL
APPELLANT	MR A CARTER
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	CONVERSION OF DETACHED GARAGE FOR USE AS COMMERCIAL PHYSIOTHERAPY CLINIC/GYM
LOCATION OF APPEAL	2 BRYNTIRION COTTAGES BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATION
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**.

APPEAL NO.	2060
APPLICATION NO.	P/25/569/FUL
APPELLANT	MR M JAMES
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	PROPOSED EXTERNAL STAIRCASE TO SIDE ELEVATION WITH NEW DOORWAY AT FIRST FLOOR LEVEL AND BALCONY TO FRONT ELEVATION
LOCATION OF APPEAL	82A BEACH ROAD PORTHCAWL
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPRESENTATION
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 B**.

APPEAL NO.	2067
APPLICATION NO.	P/25/767/FUL
APPELLANT	VJ THOMAS & SON
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	ERECT A CAR PORT THAT IS FINISHED IN WHITE POWDER COATED ALUMINIUM
LOCATION OF APPEAL	23 MARLPIT LANE PORTHCAWL
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 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 G Hall BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 29/07/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04778-Z2R2D0

Site address: 2 Bryntirion Cottages, Bryntirion Hill, Bridgend, CF31 4DZ

- 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 Anthony Carter against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/24/514/FUL, dated 20 August 2024, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2025.
 - The development is Proposed Conversion of Detached Garage for use as Physiotherapy Clinic/Gym.
 - A site visit was made on 21 May 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's decision notice and the appeal form describe the proposal as a "commercial" physiotherapy clinic/gym, whereas the planning application form does not. As the proposal is clearly for a physiotherapy clinic/gym to be used by clients attending for treatment and exercise, and the addition of the word "commercial" does not change the substance of the development proposed, I have used the description from the planning application form.
3. The Council's decision notice refers to LDP Policy DNP7 'Trees, Hedgerows and Development'. The Officer Report concludes that the proposal would be compliant with LDP Policy DNP7, and I do not consider that this policy is particularly relevant.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - whether the location of the proposed development is appropriate having regard to national and local planning policy concerning the location of development and the role of town centres;
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

Location

5. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area and is accessed via a private drive serving a small number of dwellings. It is not located within a town, district or local centre, nor within any established commercial area.
6. Policy SP12 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (LDP), together with Policy 6 of Future Wales (FW) and the advice in Planning Policy Wales (PPW), promotes a town centre first approach to the location of retail, commercial and other appropriate uses. The objective of that approach is to maintain or enhance the vibrancy, vitality and attractiveness of centres by directing such uses to the most accessible and sustainable locations. The supporting text to LDP Policy SP12 refers to a sequential test in relation to out-of-centre retail development; FW Policy 6 refers to the sequential test in relation to a wider range of significant new uses and encourages planning authorities to take a similar approach for smaller developments; and PPW explains that the sequential approach is not limited to retail development and can apply to other uses where appropriate, and that by adopting a sequential approach first preference should be to locate new development within a retail and commercial centre defined in the development plan hierarchy of centres.
7. The appellant contends that the proposed development is of an appropriate scale and nature for a residential setting and does not constitute the type of retail, health or commercial development to which the sequential approach is intended to apply. They have nevertheless provided evidence of having considered a number of alternative premises within Bridgend Town Centre and the Triangle Shopping Centre. Four potential premises were identified, and the appellant explains that, having regard to wider work commitments, business turnover and the likely rental costs of commercial units, operating from separate premises would not be financially viable.
8. I have no reason to doubt the appellant's assessment of their personal circumstances and the financial implications of operating from separate premises. However, that evidence is primarily directed towards the appellant's preferred business model and commercial viability, rather than demonstrating that the proposed use could not reasonably be accommodated in a more appropriate location. In particular, the evidence does not establish that the identified premises were unsuitable in planning or operational terms, unavailable, or otherwise unreasonable alternatives for accommodating the proposed physiotherapy clinic/gym.
9. Whilst PPW recognises that some healthcare uses may have specific accessibility requirements that justify a more flexible approach to location, the evidence before me does not demonstrate that this proposal has any such requirement or that its location is necessary to ensure access for the clients it would serve. The proposed physiotherapy clinic/gym would operate as a private business, albeit one undertaken by the occupiers of the host dwelling. I acknowledge the benefits to the appellant of operating from the appeal property; however, those matters relate primarily to the appellant's preferred working arrangements and business model rather than an inherent need for this type of use to be located within a residential setting. They do not alter the nature of the proposed use or overcome the locational considerations arising from introducing a destination use outside an established centre. Accordingly, I am not satisfied that there is a specific locational justification which would warrant the proposed out-of-centre location.
10. I acknowledge the appeal site is accessible on foot and by cycle for some local residents and benefits from nearby active travel routes. However, the appeal site remains within a suburban residential estate, accessed via a private drive and not integrated with an

established centre. Whilst some clients may travel sustainably and/or live locally, that does not make the appeal site comparable, in accessibility or locational terms, with a town, district or local centre, where such uses would generally be more accessible by a range of transport modes and better integrated with other services, facilities and complementary town centre uses.

11. The appellant presently lives in Laleston, where, following a previous grant of planning permission, part of their dwelling is used as a physiotherapy treatment room. They contend that the appeal proposal is comparable to that development and that the Council has therefore been inconsistent in determining applications of this type. However, I am not persuaded that the earlier permission provides a direct parallel with the appeal proposal. That case involved the use of part of an existing dwelling for a treatment room, whereas the present proposal involves the conversion of a detached outbuilding to create a dedicated physiotherapy clinic/gym, with associated client visits. Moreover, each proposal must be determined on its own merits and against the relevant policy framework. The earlier decision does not demonstrate that the appeal site is an appropriate location for the proposed use, nor does it outweigh the conflict I have identified with the town centre first approach.
12. The appellant has also drawn my attention to businesses located on the Broadlands estate, including those offering beauty treatment, sports massage and gym facilities. Whilst I observed one such business during my site visit, I have limited evidence regarding the planning circumstances in which all those other uses were established or authorised. Their existence does not justify the appeal proposal, which must be assessed on its own merits against the relevant policy framework.
13. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal has not demonstrated sufficient justification for locating the physiotherapy clinic/gym outside an established centre. The evidence before me does not demonstrate that there is a specific locational justification which outweighs the objectives of the town centre first approach. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with LDP Policy SP12, FW Policy 6 and the relevant guidance in PPW.

Living conditions

14. The proposal would introduce an appointment-based physiotherapy clinic/gym into a detached outbuilding within a predominantly residential setting. Although the use would be operated by the occupiers of the host dwelling, it would involve members of the public travelling to and from the site for treatment. That activity would be materially different in character from the ordinary domestic use of an ancillary garage.
15. The appeal site is served by a private drive shared with a small number of neighbouring dwellings. In that context, the regular arrival and departure of clients would be noticeable to neighbouring occupiers, particularly because those visits would arise from the operation of the clinic rather than the normal residential occupation of the dwelling. The proposal would therefore introduce a regular and commercial pattern of activity into an otherwise quiet residential environment, resulting in increased disturbance that would be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
16. The fact that the business would be operated by residents of the dwelling would not alter the external effects of the proposed use. Nor would staggered appointments prevent the creation of a regular pattern of customer visits, vehicle movements and pedestrian activity associated with a physiotherapy clinic/gym. I recognise that residential properties commonly receive visits from family, friends, deliveries, tradespeople and other service providers. However, those visits are incidental to the residential occupation of the dwelling and are generally variable in frequency, duration and timing. By contrast, the appeal

proposal would establish a planned and repeated pattern of client visits connected with an ongoing clinic use. In my view, that distinction is important when assessing the effect on neighbouring living conditions.

17. I have taken into account that the Environmental Health Officer did not object on noise grounds. However, that response is not determinative of the broader planning judgement before me. My concern is not limited to noise from within the building but to the cumulative effect of customer arrivals and departures, vehicle movements, doors opening and closing, headlights and associated activity on the shared private drive, which would harmfully impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
18. I have considered whether conditions including those controlling opening hours, staffing levels or appointment-only visits would overcome this harm. Such conditions could reduce the extent of activity, but they would not alter the essential nature of the use or its relationship with neighbouring dwellings because they would not prevent the regular arrival and departure of clients associated with the operation of the clinic. The proposal would still introduce regular customer activity into a shared residential environment where such activity would give rise to unacceptable disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.
19. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers through the regular pattern of customer visits, associated vehicle movements and general activity generated by the clinic. It would therefore conflict with LDP Policy SP3, which seeks to ensure that development does not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Highway and pedestrian safety

20. Old Mansion Close forms part of a modern planned residential estate, comprising a conventional estate road with footways on both sides of the carriageway and standard highway junctions. In contrast, the appeal site is accessed via a private drive from Old Mansion Close, which is narrower, functions as a shared surface and lacks dedicated pedestrian footways. The drive is intended to serve the low-speed traffic associated with the small number of dwellings it accesses. Visibility at its junction with Old Mansion Close is restricted, particularly to the left when emerging, due to the boundary hedge. The entrance to the private drive is also relatively inconspicuous when travelling along Old Mansion Close, particularly for first-time visitors.
21. The appellant contends that the additional vehicle movements arising from the proposal would be limited. According to the appellant, even on the busiest day and assuming all clients travel by car, the proposal would generate no more than ten vehicle movements, with appointments staggered throughout the day. They also say that there have been no recorded accidents associated with the access over a prolonged period and argue that the hedge reflects an existing characteristic of the access rather than a constraint arising from the proposal.
22. As I observed during my site visit, the private drive is narrow and functions as a shared surface used by both pedestrians and vehicles. I have also taken account of the representations from local residents that the private drive is used for walking, exercise and wider well-being purposes. This reinforces my view that pedestrians may reasonably be present on the shared surface and should be considered when assessing the potential for conflict with additional vehicle movements.
23. The private drive's limited width means that opposing vehicles could meet on the drive, requiring one vehicle to reverse or manoeuvre within a constrained area where there is limited space to do so safely. That risk would be heightened by the additional vehicle movements generated by regular client visits, particularly as many drivers would be

unfamiliar with the layout and operation of the access. In those circumstances, additional vehicle movements and manoeuvring within this tight shared space would increase the potential for conflict not only between vehicles, but also between vehicles and pedestrians using the drive.

24. The existing visibility constraint at the junction is not overcome by the fact that the hedge is longstanding, or by the absence of evidence of recorded collisions. Those matters may describe the historic operation of the access, but they do not demonstrate that it would be suitable for the regular additional client traffic associated with the proposed use. Collision records are only one indicator of highway safety, and the absence of recorded accidents does not establish that an intensified use would not increase risk. On the evidence before me, I am not satisfied that the existing visibility at the junction is adequate to safely accommodate the additional client traffic associated with the proposed use.
25. I have considered whether planning conditions including those restricting visits to appointment only, staffing levels or hours of operation would overcome these concerns. However, such conditions would not alter the physical characteristics of the private drive or improve the restricted visibility at its junction with Old Mansion Close. Whilst they could reduce the frequency of vehicle movements, they would not remove the need for regular client traffic to use the constrained shared access, nor ensure that the level of activity would remain at that envisaged over the lifetime of the development.
26. The parties also disagree on the adequacy of the proposed parking and turning arrangements within the appeal site. I have considered those matters. However, even if I were to conclude that the parking and turning arrangements were satisfactory, this would not overcome my findings regarding the constrained shared access and restricted visibility at its junction with Old Mansion Close. Those deficiencies would remain and continue to give rise to unacceptable highway and pedestrian safety concerns. The adequacy of the parking and turning arrangements is therefore not determinative of the appeal.
27. Taking these matters together, I conclude that the proposal would give rise to an unacceptable risk to highway and pedestrian safety, and would conflict with LDP Policy SP3, which seeks to promote connections within and outside of sites to ensure efficient and equitable access for all.

Other Matters and Conclusion

28. The appellant suggests that the proposed use would remain ancillary to the residential use of the property and as such would not amount to a material change of use requiring planning permission. The question of whether the proposed development requires planning permission is not before me, and as such I make no determination on that point. My role is to determine the appeal made against the Council's refusal of planning permission, and I have assessed the proposal accordingly.
29. I have noted the representations submitted both in support of and objecting to the proposal and have considered all the matters raised. I have taken into account the health and well-being benefits that the proposed development could provide, including the testimonials submitted in support of the appellant, among them an email from a GP. I have also had regard to the evidence that the physiotherapy and associated services proposed could provide treatment for patients who might otherwise experience difficulty accessing care through the NHS. These are material considerations to which I attach moderate weight. However, they do not outweigh the conflict with the development plan, nor do they overcome the harm I have identified.
30. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

31. 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 Melissa Hall

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 10/08/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04898-J4R9G7

Site address: 82A Beach Road, Newton, Porthcawl, CF36 5NE

- 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 Mark James against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/25/569/FUL, dated 19 September 2025, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2026.
 - The development proposed is an external staircase to side elevation with new doorway at first floor level and balcony to front elevation.
 - A site visit was made on 21 July 2026 by Mr T. Braithwaite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
3. The description of development given on the original application form differs from the one on the Council's decision notice and appeal form. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice and appeal form, as it is more accurate and concise.
4. I have identified inconsistencies between the existing elevations, proposed elevations, and what is present on site at the time of my visit. These relate to omission of an existing dormer window in the southern hip of the roof of the existing dwelling and the inclusion of an external staircase leading from the front balcony. As the dormer is an existing feature on the dwelling and is not determinative to this appeal, this inconsistency has no bearing on my recommendation. I will deal with the inconsistencies in the drawings denoting the front balcony later in my report.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Beach Road is a residential street which fronts Newton beach, separated by the highway. Properties are set back from the street with generous front gardens and driveways. Boundaries are denoted by a mix of low boundary walls of red brick or render, with some fencing atop, along with intermittent vehicle access gates.
7. In the context of the above, and notwithstanding the coastal location, the area has a residential character through the dwellings' typical domestic appearance, with a variety of householder extensions such as porches and roof additions. Many properties in the street also have first floor front balconies / verandas of varying scales, styles and external finishes.
8. The appeal property is semi-detached located centrally along Beach Road. As I understand from the Council, it has been lawfully converted into two flats, with permission to be used as short-term holiday accommodation. The property is typical in its form and proportions as part of a traditional semi-detached pair. Accordingly, in my view it still reads as a single dwelling and contributes to the street's strong residential character.
9. The proposal comprises two main elements: a first-floor front balcony spanning the full width of the principal elevation finished in steel framing, a decked surface and glass balustrade, together with a powder coated external metal staircase to the side elevation with associated new door opening at first floor level. The submitted information confirms that the staircase would provide a separate means of access to the first floor flat and, by doing so, remove the need for the existing shared access arrangement from the ground floor.
10. On my site visit I saw there was an absence of external staircases on properties on Beach Road, and so the proposal would introduce a new feature in the streetscene. Although the properties are set back from the street, the low boundary treatments fronting the road result in the side elevation of the appeal property being visible from the street and wider public realm on Newton beach. Whilst I acknowledge that the staircase would be set back from the principal elevation, thus reducing its visual prominence, it would represent a utilitarian addition to the residential appearance of the property. This is not a feature found elsewhere in the street and, to my mind, is different in its visual impact upon the property to that of existing front balconies. It would therefore represent an unsympathetic addition to the otherwise largely traditional appearance of the property.
11. The presence of the staircase would also necessitate a new doorway opening at first floor level to achieve separate access to the first floor flat. I observed other properties in the immediate vicinity had doorways on their front elevations onto balconies, however none were evident on side elevations. The fenestration on the appeal dwelling's side elevation is irregularly spaced and sized, with a shared access doorway at ground floor only. The same is true for its neighbour to the south. In this visual context, the addition of a doorway at first floor level would appear at odds with the style and arrangement of fenestration. When considered together, the staircase and doorway would collectively give rise to development that discords with the prevailing residential character of the dwellings on Beach Road.
12. I note the Council's contention that the staircase would be an arbitrary addition given that the shared access arrangement for the flats currently operates sufficiently. Whilst I have no information before me from the appellant to suggest the existing arrangement functions inadequately at present, the question here is not if an element of the development proposal is necessary, but whether it would be visually acceptable. This matter has been addressed above.

13. For these reasons, I find the external staircase and doorway would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and area, contrary to policy SP3 of the adopted Bridgend County Borough Local Development Plan 2018-2033 and SPG 02 'Householder Development' Supplementary Planning Guidance, which seek to ensure new development enhances local distinctiveness and conforms to high standards of design.

Other matters

14. The proposal also seeks the erection of a first-floor balcony across the front elevation. This element of the proposal is not cited in the Council's reason for refusal, and I therefore conclude that it found the balcony to be acceptable in its consideration of the application. I have no reason to come to a different conclusion.
15. I have considered recommending that a split decision be issued, which dismisses the appeal insofar as it relates to the external staircase but allows the appeal in relation to the front balcony. In principle, I consider that these elements of the scheme are clearly severable.
16. Notwithstanding this, there is inconsistency between the proposed floorplans and elevations insofar as an external staircase is shown forward of the balcony on proposed floor plans drawing no.003 Rev P1 and the proposed front elevation on drawing no.004 Rev P2, but omitted from the proposed left side elevation on this same plan. The description of development also only makes reference to one external staircase to the side elevation, with no mention of the front staircase. As such, I cannot be certain that this element is indeed included in the appeal scheme. The absence of any annotations on the proposed plans detailing its external finishes adds to my uncertainty.
17. With this in mind, I do not have sufficient detailed information or accurate drawings before me to make an informed assessment of this element. I am also not satisfied that, in the event of my recommending a split decision, this element is severable from the front balcony were I to find against it. To this end, I do not feel a split decision is appropriate, and I have not therefore taken this matter any further.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

T Braithwaite

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, I agree with the reasoning and conclusions contained therein and on that basis the appeal is dismissed in the terms recommended above.
20. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. 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.

Melissa Hall

Inspector



Appeal Decision

by Paul Selby BEng (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 29/07/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-04998-L0D3K9

Site address: 23 Marlpit Lane, Nottage, Porthcawl CF36 5EG

- 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 Glyn Richards (VJ Thomas and Son) against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/25/767/FUL, dated 18 December 2025, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2026.
 - The development proposed is a car port that is finished in white powder coated aluminium.
 - A site visit was made on 13 July 2026 by Georgia Peters.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
3. The submitted appeal documentation includes a reference to an amended scheme; however, for the purposes of this appeal, the proposed development has been assessed based on the plans and details as originally submitted and determined by the local planning authority.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a gabled dormer bungalow with a small hardstanding front garden and a driveway in front of a detached garage. The property is central to a row of dwellings but marks the start of a run of several bungalows of similar architectural design and materials, visually separated from one another by modest side driveways, passages and subordinate structures. Whilst there is some variation in external finishes and boundary treatments, the area remains unified by its common design features and cohesive materials which make a positive contribution to the area's character and appearance.
6. The proposed car port would be located at the south-eastern elevation of the bungalow, covering the existing driveway in front of the detached garage. Whilst set moderately

back from the front elevation of the dwelling, the height of the proposed structure would exceed the eaves of the host property and would be visible in its entirety from public view. Although the structure would be lower in height than nearby properties, the car port would appear disproportionate in scale to the host property and cramped within the plot, creating discordance in the street scene.

7. Furthermore, the proposed materials would not be consistent with the host property or surrounding properties. Combined with its open-sided design and large arched roof, the car port would present an overtly modern and utilitarian appearance that would jar with the style and materials of the existing dwelling. Therefore, due to its scale, materials and design, the proposed car port would appear visually intrusive and would detract from the character of the host property and wider street scene. Irrespective of the likely modest number of vehicles and pedestrians using the road, and the absence of dwellings opposite the site, the visual harm would nevertheless persist and be experienced by existing and future residents of the surrounding area, as well as by passing road users and pedestrians.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development subject to this appeal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to policy SP3 of the Bridgend Replacement Local Development Plan (2024).

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Georgia Peters

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report. I agree with the reasoning and conclusions contained therein and on that basis the appeal is dismissed in the terms recommended above.
11. 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.

Paul Selby

Inspector