

<b>BLAENAU GWENT COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL</b>	
<b>Report to</b>	<b>Planning, Regulatory &amp; General Licensing Committee</b>
<b>Report Subject</b>	<b>Planning Appeal Update: 51 Tynewydd Nantybwich Tredegar Ref.: C/2020/0202</b>
<b>Report Author</b>	<b>Jane Engel</b>
<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Regeneration and Community Services</b>
<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>15<sup>th</sup> April 2021</b>
<b>Date Signed off by Monitoring Officer</b>	

### **Report Information**

#### **1. Purpose of Report**

To advise Members of the decision of the Planning Inspectorate in respect of a planning appeal against the refusal of planning permission ref: C/2020/0202 for a proposed garage in the front garden of 51 Tynewydd, Nantybwich, Tredegar The application was refused under delegated powers on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

#### **2. Scope of the Report**

The applicant was refused for two reasons: Officers were of the view that the siting of the garage forward of the dwelling's principle elevation resulted in an incongruous structure that would have an unacceptable visual impact upon the streetscene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to policy DM1 2 (b) of the adopted Blaenau Gwent Local Development Plan (LDP) and the Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 2 Householder Design Guidance,

Policy DM1 of the LDP requires that proposals for development have regards for the safe, effective and efficient use of the transportation network. The Council's Built Infrastructure Team Manager objected to the planning application on the grounds that any vehicles egressing the garage would not be able to see pedestrians walking along the public footway outside the property. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DM1 3 (a) of the LDP

The applicant appealed this decision on the grounds that planning permission should have been granted. The Inspector's decision was received on 23rd February 2021 (the decision letter is attached for Members Information).

In summary, the Inspector dismissed the appeal. He was of the opinion that the garage would erode the existing open character of the gardens and concurred with LPA's assessment that the garage would appear incongruous to the setting and harmful to the areas character and appearance.

The Inspector commented that there was little evidence of significant pedestrian activity on the footway, However, he considered that the inadequate visibility for existing drivers caused by the garage's siting and solid construction would introduce an unacceptable risk of harmful conflict with pedestrians using the footway.

In conclusion, the Inspector considered that the proposed development would conflict the aim of policy DM1 (2) b of the LDP to avoid unacceptable adverse visual impact on the townscape or landscape and with advice given in the Councils \*Householder Design Guidance\* Supplementary Planning Guidance. Furthermore, he considered that the proposal would not accord with the objectives of the LDP policy DM1 (3) (a) for proposals to have regard to the safe, effective and efficient use of the transportation network.

Accordingly, he **DISMISSED** the appeal and planning permission was refused for the development.

### 3. Recommendation/s for Consideration

1. That Members note for information the appeal decision for planning application C/2020/0202 as attached at **Appendix A**.