

SECTION B – MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

APPEALS DETERMINED

a) Planning Appeals

Appeal Ref: A2015/0009 **Planning Ref:** P2015/0395

PINS Ref: APP/Y6930/A/15/3134752

Applicant: Mr R Ferguson

Proposal: Installation of balconies to front elevation

Site Address: Ferguson House, Bethel Street, Neath SA11
2HQ

Appeal Method: Written Representations

Decision Date: 19th January 2016

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

The application was refused on the basis that the proposed balconies would have an adverse impact on visual amenity. The inspector indicated that with the use of balustrade the first floor balconies could be acceptable. However the second floor balcony which was proposed to extend across the upper floor would result in features that would disturb the balance and proportions of the building. As such the balcony was considered to have harmful visual impacts arising from the length, scale and projection of the balcony overall. On consideration of the appeal, the inspector concluded that the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the existing building with consequent harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such the inspector concluded that the proposal would be contrary to GC1 and ENV17 of the UDP.

Appeal Ref: A2016/0001 **Planning Ref:** P2014/1064

PINS Ref: APP/Y6930/A/15/3138892

Applicant: Mr K Thomas

Proposal: Construction of One Residential Dwelling.

Site Address: Plot adjacent to Penrhiw, Woodbine Cottages,
Melincourt, Neath SA11 4BA

Appeal Method: Written Representations

Decision Date: 4th April 2016

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

The application was refused on the basis that the addition of a further house to be served off this access point would be to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.

The Inspector noted that the access lane is not wide enough for two vehicles to pass, and the boundary walls and hedgerows make it difficult for drivers of vehicles turning off the main road to see whether they are able to enter the lane safely. Were vehicle conflict to arise at or near to the junction, the steepness of the lane would make reversing difficult for the existing vehicle. In such a situation vehicles turning into the lane from the main road would be more likely to manoeuvre accordingly, creating a potential hazard for vehicles using the B4434 to the detriment of the safety of highway users.

The inspector concluded that the proposal would intensify the use of the access lane and lead to increased risk of vehicle conflict at its junction with the B4434, with unacceptable harmful effects on the safety of highway users, contrary to the objectives of Policy TR2 of the LDP and TAN 18.