

THE VALE OF GLAMORGAN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 14<sup>TH</sup> JUNE, 2006

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION

4. APPEALS

(a) Planning Appeals Received

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01392/LAW  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198438  
Appellant: Mr. G.A. Brookfield  
**Location:** **19, Lake Hill Drive, Cowbridge**  
Proposal: Rear porch extension  
Start Date: 20<sup>th</sup> April, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01661/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198511  
Appellant: J. Pidgeon & Son Limited,  
**Location:** **181, Court Road, Barry**  
Proposal: Detached single storey cold store room to rear  
Start Date: 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01771/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198512  
Appellant: Mr. P. Cancelliere,  
**Location:** **Manor House Hotel, Sully Road, Penarth**  
Proposal: Temporary marquee until November 2006  
Start Date: 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01930/FUL  
Appeal Method: Hearing  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198518  
Appellant: Newydd Housing Association  
**Location:** **248, Holton Road, Barry**  
Proposal: Change of use of vacant offices to 3 No. 1 bedroom flats and ground floor office to provide temporary accommodation for persons with previous substance misuse problems and/or an offending background  
Start Date: 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2006/00088/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198582  
Appellant: Rhidian Llewellyn  
**Location:** **Land at Caercady, Welsh St. Donats**  
Proposal: Improvements to existing access and retention of constructed driveway  
Start Date: 25<sup>th</sup> April, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2006/00035/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198644  
Appellant: Mr. and Mrs. White  
**Location:** **180, Port Road East, Barry**  
Proposal: Increase size of rear dormer window  
Start Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2003/00720/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198594  
Appellant: Charles Insurance Consultants Ltd  
**Location:** **Adjacent Penarth Carpets, Queens Gate Mews, Albert Road, Penarth**  
Proposal: Construction of a building for retail purposes  
Start Date: 5<sup>th</sup> May, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01173/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198703  
Appellant: Mr. & Mrs. M. J. Long  
**Location:** **5, Croft Street, Cowbridge**  
Proposal: Rear extensions  
Start Date: 9<sup>th</sup> May, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01211/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198704  
Appellant: Simon Wenham  
**Location:** **3, Croft Street, Cowbridge**  
Proposal: Rear extensions  
Start Date: 9<sup>th</sup> May, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01885/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198712  
Appellant: Mr. D. & Mrs. E. Kidby  
**Location:** **The Oaks, Marine Parade, Penarth**  
Proposal: Two storey side extension  
Start Date: 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01639/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198800  
Appellant: A. G. Developments  
**Location:** **Chestnut Tree Cottage, Craig Penllyn**  
Proposal: Construct two new three bedroom detached dwellings.  
Widen vehicle access to side. Construct new access  
drive and associated parking for new dwellings and  
existing cottage  
Start Date: 12<sup>th</sup> May, 2006

L.P.A. Reference No: 2006/00077/FUL  
Appeal Method: Public Local Inquiry  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198856  
Appellant: J. Williams  
**Location:** **Sealawns Hotel, Ogmore By Sea**  
Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings on site and  
construction of 24 flats, parking on existing car park  
and disabled parking at high level together with hard &  
soft landscaping  
Start Date: 18<sup>th</sup> May, 2006

---

(b) Enforcement Appeals Received

L.P.A. Reference No: ENF/2004/0597/M  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198571  
Appellant: Peter & Karen Lansdown  
**Location:** **12, Four Acre, Llantwit Major**  
Proposal: Without the benefit of planning permission, construct a  
rear facing dormer window extension of a size,  
massing and scale that is significantly at variance and  
therefore contrary to that shown on the approved plans  
of planning permission reference 00/00764/FUL issued  
on the 4<sup>th</sup> August, 2000  
Start Date: 25<sup>th</sup> April, 2006

---

(c) Planning Appeal Decisions

L.P.A. Reference No: 2002/01518/OUT  
Appeal Method: Public Local Inquiry  
Appeal Reference No: 03/1121373  
Appellant: Cofton Land and Property  
**Location:** **Land allocated for employment use, Rhoose Point**  
Proposal: Outline application for residential development  
Decision: Appeal Withdrawn  
Date: 21<sup>st</sup> April, 2006  
Council Determination: Appeal against non-determination

## Comments

Following extensive discussions between Officers and the appellants, the above appeal has been withdrawn prior to consideration at the scheduled Public Inquiry.

It is anticipated that further application(s) may be forthcoming for development on the appeal site which seek to maintain the objective of achieving a sustainable mixed use community at Rhoose Point.

---

L.P.A. Reference No:	2005/01707/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	06/1197794
Appellant:	Mr. & Mrs. I. Evans,
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Great House Farm Barn, Llandough</b>
Proposal:	Revised rear garden room extension
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Date:	27 <sup>th</sup> April, 2006
Inspector:	Mr. P. Macdonald
Council Determination:	Delegated

## Summary

The Inspector noted that the appeal property was converted under a 2003 planning permission, which withdrew permitted development rights, and that the scheme proposed to construct a garden room, some 6m by 4.5m, and 4.4m high to the ridge, against the rear wall of the building.

The Inspector referred to Policy ENV7 (now ENV8) of the adopted UDP and stated that "it is obvious this policy must also be applied to subsequent proposals for extensions to converted buildings, otherwise Policy ENV7 could easily be circumvented".

He thus concluded that the appeal proposal failed to accord with Policy ENV7 (ENV8) since it proposed a relatively large addition, at odds with the simple rural character of the converted building, which was also easily visible from the nearby public footpath. Whether, as claimed by the appellant, that footpath is little used was deemed irrelevant.

## Comments

This provides a further demonstration of the ability of the Council to resist against the inappropriate extension of converted barns, as well as additional support for the application of Policy ENV7 (ENV8) post-conversion.

---

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/00656/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197791  
Appellant: Mr. R. Jones  
**Location:** **Barn at Gwern y Gaer Isaf, Peterston-Super-Ely**  
Proposal: Conversion of barn to dwelling  
Decision: Appeal Dismissed  
Date: 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2006  
Inspector: Mr. P. Macdonald  
Council Determination: Committee

## Summary

The Inspector noted that an identical proposal, using the same drawings, was the subject of a dismissed appeal six years ago. He considered there to be three main issues, these being: - the effect on the rural character of the landscape of the Ely Valley and Ridge Slopes Special Landscape Area; the adequacy of the proposed access; and whether the proposed dwelling would constitute an unsustainable form of development.

The previous Inspector considered that the proposals failed to satisfy criteria within Policy ENV7 given the visual intrusion of a residential curtilage into the countryside. Although the appellant claimed to have dealt with the matter by screen planting of trees between the barn and the railway line, the Inspector stated that this would not resolve the matter. Rather, it would remain true that a residential curtilage, distinct from the curtilages of the nearby dwellings, would be created in an area of open countryside within a Special Landscape Area. He considered it to be a material change in circumstances, and not to the appellant's advantage, that the SLA had been designated since the previous appeal decision.

In any respect, the Inspector stated that, even if the visibility of the domestic curtilage from the railway line were reduced by the planting carried out, there would doubtless be other points, particularly on the rising ground to the south, from which it would be visible. He thus stated that it is the creeping 'suburbanization' of the countryside which is at issue, and that the extent of the incursion into the rural landscape would be unacceptable.

The third aspect of Policy ENV7 considered in 2000 related to the adequacy of vehicular access. The Inspector agreed with the earlier decision that the vehicular access is inadequate to accommodate the traffic generated by a third dwelling. The appellant had pointed out that the barn has been divided into two dwellings without planning permission, and that this is now secure from enforcement. He thus offered to accept a condition returning the converted barn to one dwelling, so that the appeal scheme would leave the site with three dwellings, and no overall increase in traffic.

The Inspector, however, was unwilling to impose such a condition, for two reasons. Firstly, he considered it contrary to proper planning procedures that the appellant should be, in effect, "rewarded" in this way for having formed a new dwelling without planning permission. Secondly, the access has been judged suitable (by a 1989 appeal decision) to accommodate the traffic generated by two dwellings, but (by the 2000 appeal decision) not three. He noted that the traffic from the third is not authorised. The suggested condition would mean, in effect, that he would have accepted the access as being suitable to accommodate the traffic generated by a third dwelling and this, given its obvious deficiencies, he was not prepared to do.

The Inspector stated, however, that "the most serious objection" to the proposal is that the creation of a new residential unit in this rural location, distant from a proper road and over a mile away from the nearest village, and heavily dependant upon car usage, constitutes an unsustainable form of development. He stated that a major change since the previous appeal decision has been the publication in March 2002 of the revised Planning Policy Wales, with its increased emphasis on sustainability. In this respect, the policy background, both local and national, was concluded to be distinctly less favourable to the appeal proposal than it was at the time of the last appeal.

## Comments

In light of the previous appeal decision, which proposed an identical conversion, it is very satisfying that the Inspector has supported the Council in its continued refusal of such new residential development in the countryside.

It is also particularly notable, in respect of the highway matters, that the Inspector has stated that it would be inappropriate to 'reward' the appellant for having undertaken an unauthorised conversion of a barn in the past.

---

L.P.A. Reference No:	2005/00937/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	06/1197723
Appellant:	Mr. P. Cronin,
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Land to the rear of 9, Bradenham Place, Penarth</b>
Proposal:	Demolish existing garage and outbuilding and construct 2 No. town houses.
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Date:	27 <sup>th</sup> April, 2006
Inspector:	Mr. P. G. Horridge
Council Determination:	Committee

## Summary

This summary relates jointly to application refs. 2005/00937/FUL and 2005/00938/FUL, which involved alternative proposals for the same site.

The Inspector considered the issues in both appeals to concern the effects of the proposals on the character and appearance of the conservation area, on the living conditions of adjoining residents and future residents of the appeal site, and on parking conditions in the locality.

### Impact on Conservation Area

Although this appeal site affords a break in development, the Inspector did not regard it as an important feature of the conservation area meriting retention. He also considered that the design of both appeal buildings echoes features found in the locality, such that the buildings themselves would fit in with their neighbours. The limited forecourt parking would still allow the introduction of a limited front garden area which could provide some visual relief and enhancement. In terms of the first issue, he thus concluded that overall both developments would enhance the appearance of the Conservation Area.

### Effect on Living Conditions of Future Residents

Although both schemes involve limited private amenity space which, for the 2 town houses is virtually non-existent, nevertheless given the town centre location of the site, where full provision of amenity space is not always achievable or necessarily desired by residents, he did not regard this as a significant shortcoming of the schemes.

### Effect on Living Conditions of Neighbouring Residents

Both schemes would result in new two or three storey buildings close to the rear garden of No. 10 Bradenham Place. The pair of two-storey town houses would occupy a significant length of the boundary at a distance of 1-1.5m from the neighbouring garden. The single house would occupy a lesser length but would be a taller structure with accommodation on three floors. A number of windows are proposed in the rear elevations of both schemes facing the adjoining garden, but all are proposed with opaque glazing and could be non-opening to minimise overlooking.

Nevertheless, given their bulk, he concluded that the presence of these buildings so close to the boundary would detract from the enjoyment of the adjoining garden and be an oppressive feature harming the outlook from the neighbouring property.

### Effect on Parking Conditions

The appeal site currently functions as the parking area for the flat and offices at No. 9 Bradenham Place. It includes land which is designated in the planning permission for the flat for parking 2 cars. A further 4 parking spaces are required to be provided and maintained as a condition of the planning permission for the recently constructed extension to the office building. The total capacity of the present parking area is said to be approximately 10 cars.

Although the provision for the new dwelling(s) would be below that recommended by the parking standards, given the location of the site in a sustainable position close to Penarth Town Centre and public transport facilities, he did not regard the provision for the new dwellings as inadequate.

The Inspector noted, however, that the appeal schemes would both leave only 3 parking spaces to serve the flat and offices at No. 9 Bradenham Place, which would be inadequate to serve the uses remaining at that property. In this respect, he concluded that overall the scheme would unacceptably diminish parking provision in the locality, both on-site at No. 9 Bradenham Place and on-street in Hickman Road, and so lead to an increase in on-street parking elsewhere in the locality.

### **Comments**

Both of these appeal decisions are good examples of proposals which fail to take proper account of the need to respect the amenity of surrounding properties from oppressive or unneighbourly new proposals. The implications for highway safety resulting from the loss of existing parking provision is also particularly notable in the Inspector's conclusions on these appeals.

---

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/00938/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197722  
Appellant: Mr. P. Cronin,  
**Location:** **Land to the rear of 9, Bradenham Place, Penarth**  
Proposal: Demolish existing garage and outbuilding and construct single dwelling.  
Decision: Appeal Dismissed  
Date: 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2006  
Inspector: Mr. P. G. Horridge  
Council Determination: Committee

### Summary

See Appeal Summary for application ref. 2005/00937/FUL.

---

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/00789/OUT  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197795  
Appellant: Mr. P. Denton,  
**Location:** **Orchard Rise, 6, Penlan Road, Llandough**  
Proposal: Demolition of existing dormer bungalow and construction of two new dwellings  
Decision: Appeal Allowed  
Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> May, 2006  
Inspector: Mr. P. Macdonald  
Council Determination: Committee (contrary to Officer recommendation)

### Summary

The issues arising in the determination of this appeal were, firstly, the effect on the setting of an adjacent listed building: secondly, whether the appeal proposals would result in an insensitive and cramped form of development: and, thirdly, whether the proposed development would be unacceptably detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings.

The Inspector noted that the appeal property is a detached 1950s bungalow of traditional appearance located on a relatively large (915 sq.m.) site in a residential area. The dwelling is located at the end of a short private driveway which also serves a modern detached house (No. 4), a detached bungalow (No. 8), and the Grade II listed Pound Cottage (No. 2), the latter being a white painted, two storey thatched cottage of early C19 date, with more recent additions.

In considering its context, the Inspector considered that there was nothing about the existing bungalow, apart from its familiarity as part of the local scene, which makes it particularly appropriate as part of the setting of the listed building. In this respect, there was no reason why two new dwellings of a design sensitive to their location should not preserve, or even enhance, the setting of the listed building, which is already composed of modern residential development. He thus concluded that there was no listed building objection to the appeal proposals, and noted that the Council reached the same view, since that was not given as a reason for refusal.

The site was considered to be large enough to take two dwellings of modest size without giving the appearance of over development, and hence redevelopment need not result in insensitive or cramped redevelopment, particularly as the Council would retain control over the reserved matters.

In terms of the effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings, the only one which need be particularly affected is No. 8, the detached bungalow immediately to the south of the site. The Inspector considered, however, that given control over the placement of windows in the new dwellings, and suitable boundary treatment along the common boundary, there was no reason why this should cause undue problems in respect of amenity and privacy.

## Comments

In allowing this appeal, the Inspector has taken account of the relatively large size of the site, its unremarkable appearance, and its relationship with adjacent dwellings, and concluded that there were no issues which could not be overcome by design or condition.

---

L.P.A. Reference No:	2005/00411/FUL
Appeal Method:	Written Representations
Appeal Reference No:	06/1197945
Appellant:	Mr. Nicholas Stavrakis,
<b>Location:</b>	<b>23, Elfed Avenue, Penarth</b>
Proposal:	Two storey extension
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Date:	5 <sup>th</sup> May, 2006
Inspector:	Mr. Emyr Jones
Council Determination:	Delegated

## Summary

The appeal property and its neighbour were noted to form a pair of semi-detached two-storey dwellings having single storey rear kitchen annexes on the common boundary. No. 21 also has a conservatory on the rear elevation, adjacent to its kitchen annex, which appears to be a source of borrowed light to part of the living room.

The Inspector considered the orientation of the dwellings would ensure that any loss of sunlight to No. 21 would not be significant. Nonetheless, he considered the scale and mass of the proposed extension, sited immediately adjacent to the common boundary, would result in an unreasonable loss of daylight to the rear conservatory and part of the living room to No. 21 and also have a dominant and overbearing visual impact when viewed from No. 21. This, he concluded, would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 21 and conflict with Policy ENV25 as well as the guidance of the SPG. Although noting that the current occupier of No. 21 did not object to the proposal, he considered her opinion could change if the extension was built, while he was mindful of the need to safeguard the living conditions of future, as well as current, occupiers.

The Inspector noted that the Council appears to be willing to consider a 2-storey extension at No. 23 with a reduced projection of no more than 4m. Any deficiencies in accommodation could be addressed by revising the proposed layouts and reducing the ground floor, as well as the first floor, projection.

## Comments

This is a good example of where a proposal for an unacceptable depth of rear extension, which the appellants have failed to amend at application stage despite Officers requests, being supported at appeal.

---

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01642/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198111  
Appellant: Mr. H. Adams  
**Location:** **Cross Farm, Pentre Meyrick, Vale of Glamorgan**  
Proposal: Retention of partially built garage/gamesroom  
Decision: Appeal Withdrawn  
Date: 19<sup>th</sup> May, 2006

## Comments

The appellants withdrew this appeal following preparation and submission of the Council's case, quoting inaccurate measurements in the submitted plans. A new application has recently been submitted to refer to such matters.

---

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01757/ADV  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1197867  
Appellant: Clear Channel UK Limited,  
**Location:** **Gable wall of 7, Barry Road, Barry**  
Proposal: 1 X 48 sheet static non-illuminated advertising hoarding  
Decision: Appeal Dismissed  
Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2006  
Inspector: Mr. N. Shepherd  
Council Determination: Delegated

## Summary

The Inspector considered the main issue in this appeal to be the effect of the advertising hoarding on the visual amenity of the area.

Overall, he considered that this stretch of Barry Road, while not having an exceptional quality in terms of visual amenity, was certainly not without charm, such that care has to be taken not to erode this position. He thus concluded that the appeal hoarding does not directly relate to other signage in terms of height and balance, and its location close to the pavement and scale on its host wall makes it an imposing and large feature in the street scene, detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

## Comments

This decision is useful in demonstrating that, even in areas of mixed residential and commercial use, there is an essential need to ensure that any signage appropriately reflects and respects its wider setting.

Given that this hoarding has been displayed on site without the requisite consent, the Enforcement Section will now pursue its early removal from the site.

---

L.P.A. Reference No: 2005/01210/FUL  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: 06/1198108  
Appellant: Ms. Estelle Peck  
**Location:** **Byeways, Marcross**  
Proposal: Two storey extension and new cesspit  
Decision: Appeal Dismissed  
Date: 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2006  
Inspector: Ms. P. Davies  
Council Determination: Delegated

### Summary

The Inspector saw that the appeal property is traditional and modest in appearance and form, commensurate with its rural setting and the attractive undeveloped qualities of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast.

Given its prominent position close to a bend on a narrow part of a lane, the Inspector considered that, even with matching materials, the proposed extension, by reason of its height, scale and forward gable end projection, would appear as an overly large and unsympathetic addition to the existing dwelling, resulting in a substantial intrusion of built form into the rural character of its surroundings.

Whilst noting that dormers are not uncommon features in the locality, the number of dormers that were proposed, together with the projecting balcony, would, in her opinion, complicate the appearance of the dwelling with a consequent urbanising effect. All of this would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

### Comments

This is another good example of a Policy HOUS7 decision, which has also provided good support for the Council's objectives which seek to ensure that such development does not unacceptably intrude into the Glamorgan Heritage Coast.

---

(d) Enforcement Appeal Decisions Received

L.P.A. Reference No: ENF/2005/0377/E  
Appeal Method: Written Representations  
Appeal Reference No: C/06/1197012  
Appellant: Mr. Russell Thomas,  
**Location:** **Ashley House Stables, Sutton Road, Llandow (Rectory Cross)**  
Proposal: Without the benefit of planning permission, the excavation and removal of top soil and the deposit of hardcore and builders waste to construct a hard standing  
Decision: Appeal Withdrawn  
Date: 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2006

## Summary

This appeal has been withdrawn by the appellant following strong representations by Officers that continuation with the appeal, in light of fundamental opposition from the Environment Agency, in addition to the Council, would lead to an application for an award of costs against the appellant for unreasonable pursuit of the appeal 'without reasonable prospect of success'.

L.P.A. Reference No: ENF/2003/0266/M  
 Appeal Method: Written Representations  
 Appeal Reference No: 06/1198626  
 Appellant: Dr. Rob McDonald  
**Location: 1, Trehill Cottages, St. Nicholas**  
 Proposal: Without the benefit of planning permission, changing the use of the land from open countryside to a residential garden extension  
 Decision: Appeal Invalid  
 Date: 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2006  
 Council Determination: Committee

## Comments

The appeal against the Enforcement Notice was not submitted in time, hence the enforcement notice is now effective.

### (e) April 2006 – March 2007 Appeal Statistics

		Determined Appeals			Appeals withdrawn /Invalid
		Dismissed *	Allowed	Total	
Planning Appeals (incl. tree appeals)	WR	9	1	10	1
	H	-	-	-	
	PI	-	-	-	1
<b>Planning Total</b>		9	1	10	
Enforcement Appeals *	WR	1	-	1	2
	H	-	-	-	
	PI	-	-	-	
<b>Enforcement Total</b>		1	-	1	
All Appeals	WR	3	-	3	
	H	-	-	-	
	PI	-	-	-	
<b>Combined Total</b>		10 (91%)	1 (9%)	11	4

(g) List of Forthcoming Hearings and Public Inquiries

<u>DATE</u>	<u>Site and Proposal/ Breach</u>
<b>7 JUNE, 2006</b>	<b>HEARING - PLANNING APPEAL</b> 24, Broad Street Parade, Barry <i>Amend Condition 2 of planning approval 02/00017/FUL to allow opening hours of: - Monday to Thursday 10:00 to 24:00 Friday and Saturday - 10:00 to 2:00 Sunday - 10:00 to 23:00</i>
<b>11 JULY, 2006</b>	<b>HEARING - PLANNING APPEAL</b> 248, Holton Road, Barry <i>Change of use of vacant offices to 3 no. 1 bedroom flats and ground floor office to provide temporary accommodation for persons with previous substance misuse problems and/or an offending background</i>
<b>25 JULY, 2006</b>	<b>PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY - ENFORCEMENT APPEAL</b> Land to rear of The Manse, Llanbethery <i>Without the benefit of planning permission, changing the use of the land from open countryside to a residential garden extension</i>
<b>25 JULY, 2006</b>	<b>PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY - ENFORCEMENT APPEAL</b> Land to the rear of The Manse, Llanbethery <i>Constructing, without the benefit of planning permission, a stone outbuilding outside of the residential curtilage of The Manse</i>
<b>1 AUGUST, 2006</b>	<b>PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY - PLANNING APPEAL</b> The Greendown Inn, St. Georges Super Ely <i>Conversion and alteration of existing buildings to create five dwellings</i>
<b>12 SEPTEMBER, 2006</b>	<b>PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY - ENFORCEMENT APPEAL</b> The Garlands, formerly The Talbot Liveries, Walterston, Llancarfan <i>Material change of use to a mixed use including siting of a caravan and its use for residential purposes</i>
<b>15 AUGUST, 2006</b>	<b>PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY - ENFORCEMENT APPEAL</b> Gwern y Gedrych, Peterston super Ely <i>Unauthorised extensions to dwelling</i>

Background Papers

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

Contact Officer - Steve Ball, Tel: 01446 704690

Officers Consulted:

Head of Planning and Transportation.

ROB QUICK  
DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND ECONOMIC REGENERATION