

APPEALS

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

CODE NO.	A/15/3140007 (1766)
APP. NO.	P/15/333/FUL
APPELLANT	MRS MORWEN POWELL
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	SINGLE STOREY SPLIT LEVEL DWELLING WITH DOUBLE GARAGE: LAND ADJOINING 22 SYCAMORE CLOSE LITCHARD BRIDGEND
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The site forms an essential and attractive open area within the existing built up area and should remain free from further development in the interests of visual amenities contrary to Strategic Policy SP4 and Policies ENV7 and SP2 of the Local Development Plan.
2. The proposed development would result in the loss of an important wildlife habitat, which would be detrimental to local biodiversity interests contrary to Strategic Policy SP4 and Policies ENV7 and SP2 of the Local Development Plan.
3. Insufficient details in respect of the geotechnical condition of the land have been submitted to ensure that the design of the development can proceed safely and thereby enable the implications of the proposal to be properly evaluated by the Local Planning Authority.
4. Insufficient details in respect of the sustainable surface water drainage system have been submitted to enable the implications of the proposal on land stability issues to be properly evaluated by the Local Planning Authority.
5. The proposed development constitutes an infringement of the privacy of the rear private amenity space of 22 Sycamore Close by virtue of the close proximity of an elevated decked area and a first floor bedroom window on the southern elevation to the boundary with this neighbour contrary to Policy SP2 of the Local Development Plan.
6. The site is too restricted due to its steeply sloping nature of the land to accommodate a dwelling consistent with generally accepted standards of space about new residential development and thereby detract from the amenity reasonably expected to be enjoyed by future occupiers contrary to Policy SP2 of the Local Development Plan.

CODE NO.	A/15/3140154 (1767)
APP. NO.	P/15/512/OUT
APPELLANT	MR E & MRS P HUGHES
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	OUTLINE APPLICATION TO DEMOLISH 2NO. DWELLINGS & ERECT 1 NO. DWELLING AND GARAGE: MAYFIELD LALESTON
PROCEDURE	WRITTEN REPS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its siting and suggested scale parameters, constitutes an

undesirable, unjustified and sporadic form of development outside any existing settlement boundaries and would therefore represent an unacceptable and overly prominent development in the open countryside and Green wedge contrary to Policies EVN1, ENV2 & ENV3 (7) of the Bridgend Local Development Plan (2013) and Planning Policy Wales (7th Edition, July 2014).

CODE NO.	A/15/3137898 (1768)
APP. NO.	P/15/568/FUL
APPELLANT	MRS P HUGHES
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	RETENTION OF TWO STOREY GARAGE WITH STORE ABOVE (RE-SUB OF P/12/714/FUL): LAND AT DAN YR EGLWYS FARM (TY NEWYDD FARM) BETTWS
PROCEDURE	WRITTENS REPRESENTATIONS
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The development by reason of its size, siting and external finishes is tantamount to a new dwelling and results in a significant encroachment of urban built form into the countryside that fails to respect the transitional nature of the location between the settlement and the rural area and therefore has a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area contrary to the general objectives of Policies ENV1 and SP2 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 Householder Development.
2. Insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that coal mining legacy issues have been properly evaluated and the Local Planning Authority has therefore been unable to satisfy itself that the application site is safe and stable to accommodate the development.

CODE NO.	A/15/3137898 (1769)
APP. NO.	ENF/152/15/C
APPELLANT	MRS P HUGHES
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	NON COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVED PLANS (P/12/714/FUL) LAND AT DAN YR EGLWYS FARM BETTWS
PROCEDURE	ENFORCEMENT NOTICE
DECISION LEVEL	DELEGATED OFFICER

CODE NO.	A/16/3141978 (1770)
APP. NO.	P/15/387/FUL
APPELLANT	MRS H PERRETT
SUBJECT OF APPEAL	CREATE LARGER BALCONY 5M X 2.2M: LOCKS COTTAGE LOCKS COMMON PORTHCOWL

PROCEDURE DELEGATED OFFICER

DECISION LEVEL The application was approved with conditions and the appellant is appealing against condition 2 namely:

2. Prior to the beneficial use of the balcony hereby approved, a 1.8m high solid and obscure screen shall be erected along the entire southern end of the balcony, facing 14 Hutchwns Close. The screening shall be retained in perpetuity.

CODE NO. A/15/3141349 (1771)

APP. NO. P/15/543/FUL

APPELLANT MR BEN BOARD

SUBJECT OF APPEAL RETENTION OF BUILDING AS BUILT (AMENDMENT TO P/13/147/FUL)
FOR USE AS STUDIO DWELLING BY FAMILY MEMBER: 133
COWBRIDGE ROAD BRIDGEND

PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

DECISION LEVEL The application was approved with conditions and the appellant is appealing against condition 3 namely:

3. The building shall not be brought, whether wholly or partially, into residential occupation until three parking spaces have been provided in permanent materials within the site in accordance with the approved block plan. The car parking spaces shall thereafter be retained for parking purposes in perpetuity.

CODE NO. A/15/3141571 (1772)

APP. NO. P/15/611/OUT

APPELLANT MR K HAINES

SUBJECT OF APPEAL ONE DWELLING (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS
RESERVED) GARAGE SITE N.E. PEMBROKE TERRACE NANTYMOEL

PROCEDURE HEARING

DECISION LEVEL DELEGATED OFFICER

The application was refused for the following reason:

1. The site lies in the countryside and the proposal which constitutes an undesirable extension of urban development outside the designated settlement boundary of Nantymoel, would also be detrimental to the character of the area where it is intended that the existing uses of land shall remain for the most part undisturbed due to its elevated position to the rear of a traditional terrace of properties, it would be contrary to established national and local planning policies. The proposal would set an undesirable precedent for applications in this area and the Northern Uplands Special Landscape Area to the detriment of visual amenities, contrary to Policies PLA1, ENV1 and ENV3 of the Bridgend Local Development Plan.
-

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report of the Corporate Director Communities be noted.

**MARK SHEPHARD
CORPORATE DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES**

Background Papers

See relevant application reference number.