

Yr Arolygiaeth Gynllunio, Adeilad y Goron, Parc Cathays,
Caerdydd CF10 3NQ ☎ 029 2082 3889 Ffacs 029 2082 5150
e-bost wales@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk



The Planning Inspectorate, Crown Buildings, Cathays Park,
Cardiff CF10 3NQ ☎ 029 2082 3889 Fax 029 2082 5150
e-mail wales@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Penderfyniad ar yr apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 23/01/06

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23/01/06

gan/by A D Poulter BArch RIBA

Arolygydd penodwyd gan Cynulliad
Cenedlaethol Cymru

an Inspector appointed by the National
Assembly for Wales

Dyddiad/Date 13 -02- 2006

Appeal Ref: APP/F6915/A/05/1192536

Site address: Disused car park west of Forge Industrial Estate, Maesteg CF34 0BB.

The National Assembly has transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Gareth Ames against the decision of Bridgend County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/05/848/OUT, dated 22 June 2005, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2005.
- The development proposed is ten affordable dwellings and off-street parking area.

Procedural Matters

1. The application was as made in outline with all matters of detail reserved for later consideration. It was considered by the Council on the basis of an amended site plan dated 13 July 2005 and an indicative site layout. I have considered the appeal on the same basis.

Decision

2. I dismiss the appeal

Reasons

3. The application relates to sloping land adjacent to an industrial building. It has been terraced and partly surfaced as a parking area, formerly associated with the adjacent unit. Residential development in the area includes a mix of traditional terraced and semi-detached houses and more recent bungalows.

Supply of Industrial Land

4. The appeal site does not appear to have been used as a parking area for some time. It is not disputed, however, that the appeal site is land allocated for employment purposes under Policy E3(8) of the Bridgend Unitary Development Plan (UDP). If the appeal scheme were to go ahead, it would therefore reduce the amount of land available for parking associated with nearby industrial units, for small new development for employment purposes, or for extensions or additions to the adjacent unit. The proposed use would not be complimentary or ancillary to industrial uses or a 'sui generis' use suitable to be located on industrial land. It would not protect existing jobs or ensure the continued availability of a wide range of employment opportunities in the Borough. I therefore consider that the proposal would have a

harmful effect on the supply of industrial land and would conflict with UDP Policy E7. I have not been provided with evidence that would point to there being a shortage of land for affordable dwellings in the area. I therefore do not consider that it has been shown that this harm would be outweighed by a need for housing land.

Living Conditions

5. The submitted site plan indicates that, however designed and detailed, the proposed dwellings would be very close to the common boundary with the adjacent industrial unit. In addition to an unpleasant outlook from rooms and outdoor living areas, noise, fumes and odours from the adjacent industrial unit would therefore be likely to make living conditions within the proposed dwellings unsatisfactory. The proposal would conflict in this respect with UDP Policy EV45(7), which seeks to ensure that new development would be compatible with the adequate provision of amenities for the residents or users of the development. I acknowledge that there are other dwellings in the vicinity and that permission has in the past been given for a nearby parcel of land to be developed. However, as each case must be decided on its own merits this does not justify the proposal.

Highway Safety

6. The proposed development would not add to the degree to which the appeal site could be legitimately used by vehicles, and alternative, safer access could be provided by reopening a close-off access from a nearby cul-de-sac. Subject to appropriately worded conditions, I therefore do not consider that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable effect on highway safety or the free flow of traffic. The proposal would, however, be unsatisfactory for the reasons I have given above.
7. Having considered all other matters that have been raised, I find nothing to outweigh the harm and conflict with planning policy I have identified in paragraphs 4 and 5 above or to turn me away from my decision.



INSPECTOR