

SECTION B – MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

APPEALS DETERMINED

a) Planning Appeals

Appeal Ref: A2016/0012 **Planning Ref:** P2016/0210

PINS Ref: APP/Y6930/A/16/3158780

Applicant: Mr Elliott Jones

Proposal: Retention and completion of detached outbuilding

Site Address: 60 Neath Road, Resolven, Neath, SA11 4AH

Appeal Method: Written Representations

Decision Date: 02/02/17

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

The application was refused on the basis that the outbuilding by reason of its excessive height, would result in a dominant structure which would appear incongruous in relation to the smaller scaled garages/outbuildings which are in existence in the rear gardens of the properties located in this street and would materially harm the character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector noted that the appeal building is situated on a rear lane characterised by garages and outbuildings of varying appearance and form. Nonetheless, most are single storey and modest in scale and their location on the edge of the built-up area adjacent to open fields is a further factor which softens the wider visual impact. Other tall buildings on the lane, were noted to be distanced from the appeal development which would be viewed primarily in the context described, including the two low height buildings that lie on either side of it.

The finished development would be significantly taller than the adjoining buildings and its height would also be reflected in a

building of substantial bulk and volume. Owing to this, in views from the lane entrance at Nant Y Gleisiad the development would be an overly prominent feature that would disrupt the pleasant visual rhythm that is presently derived from the simplistic semi-rural character of the lane.

Other developments in Resolven drawn to the Inspector's attention were not directly comparable, and having regard to the individual context of the appeal proposal, the Inspector concluded that by reason of its height and scale, it would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to the objectives of Policy BE1 of the LDP which expects all development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. Personal considerations put forward by the appellant were not sufficient to outweigh the identified harm or the conflict with the development plan.

For the above reasons the Inspector dismissed the appeal.