

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE : 7 SEPTEMBER 2022

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING

3. APPEALS

(a) Planning Appeals Received

None.

(b) Enforcement Appeals Received

None.

(c) Planning Appeal Decisions

LPA Reference No:	2021/01685/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	CAS-01915-S8T0J7
Appellant:	Mr. S. Crockford
Location:	32, Slade Road, Barry
Proposal:	Two storey side extension with rear Juliette balcony
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Date:	16 August 2022
Inspector:	N Jones
Council Determination:	Delegated

Summary

The main issue was considered to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal property was one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and with two other pairs, formed three blocks of consistently scaled dwellings set at an oblique angle to Slade Road.

The Inspector identified that the proposed side extension would lengthen the property further north than the position of the existing garage, towards Collard Crescent. Although No 32 was not seen in context with its attached pair, it was located on a prominent and visible corner when viewed from the junction of Collard Crescent with Lydstep Road. The Inspector considered that from this aspect, where it would be seen in combination with the existing dwelling and No 30, the proposal would appear disproportionate due to its bulk and massing. Owing to its length, together with limited set-back and set-down from the front elevation and ridge of the existing dwelling, it would create a visually dominant and inconsistent extension to the semi-detached pair.

When viewed from Slade Road, it was considered that the three blocks of dwellings merged in the view, however lower down the hill, No 30 and No 32 became visible as a pair. The Inspector considered that the proposed scheme would unbalance the semi-detached pair and whilst the appeal site differed from its neighbours in occupying a larger enclosed garden which could accommodate an extension, this would not overcome the harm arising from the scale of the proposal and its adverse relationship with its context.

The proposal would present a tall expanse of largely blank elevation to the street and the Inspector considered there was uncertainty whether the use of materials would relieve the appearance of the proposed front elevation and would not mitigate the visual imbalance of the proposed placement of the garage door. It was therefore concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and fail to comply with Policies MD2 and MD5 of the LDP and the Council's SPG on 'Residential and Householder Development'. Whilst the appellant had referred to other extensions in the locality, the Inspector considered there was no other similar development that had any significant influence on the area's character to warrant the identified harm. It was therefore concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

(d) Enforcement Appeal Decisions

None.

(e) April 2022 – March 2023 Appeal Statistics

		Determined Appeals			Appeals withdrawn /Invalid
		Dismissed	Allowed	Total	
Planning Appeals (to measure performance)	W	6	5	11	1
	H	-	-	-	-
	PI	-	-	-	-
Planning Total		6 (55%)	5 (45%)	11	1
Committee Determination		1	2	3	-
Other Planning appeals (inc. appeal against a condition)		-	-	-	1
Enforcement Appeals	W	2	-	2	-
	H	-	-	-	-
	PI	-	-	-	-
Enforcement Total		2 (100%)	-	2	-
All Appeals (excludes non validation appeals)	W	8	5	13	2
	H	-	-	-	-
	PI	-	-	-	-
Combined Total		8 (62%)	5 (38%)	13	2

Background Papers

Relevant appeal decision notices and application files (as detailed above).

Contact Officer:

Sarah Feist - Tel: 01446 704690

Officers Consulted:

HEAD OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING