



Appeal Decision

by T Leck BA (Hons) MSc

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 04/08/2026

Appeal reference: CAS-05077-S6R7T4

Site address: 35 Heol Y Glyn, Millbrook, Treharris CF46 5RX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Michael Day against the decision of Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/26/0007, dated 9 January 2026, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2026.
 - The development proposed is described as a “single storey garage extension to the front of the existing dwelling. The extension will be designed to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property, utilising matching brickwork, roof tiles, and fascia boards. The overall intent is for the extension to appear as an integral part of the original building, maintaining visual continuity and architectural coherence”.
 - A site visit was made on 13 July 2026.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development, it is clear from ‘Proposed Plans Sheet 1 reference CD-35-1001 Rev. A’ and the Council’s Officer Report that the proposed development includes the removal of a circa 4m section of the front boundary wall to provide an additional vehicular access. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.
3. At the time of my site visit, the garage was under construction. I understand that the Council has since granted planning permission for an amended scheme. The description of development in the appeal form, and some of the submitted plans, relate to that approved scheme. For clarity, my decision is based on the plans that were before the Council when it considered the appeal scheme.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety, with particular regard to parking provision and the safe and effective use of Heol Y Glyn.

Reasons

5. The appeal site has a substantial driveway that spans the front of the site. A small boundary wall encloses the front boundary with an opening providing vehicular access in front of the constructed garage.
6. The substandard size of the proposed garage has been cited in the Council's reason for refusal. However, the Council confirm that adequate parking provision would be retained on the driveway to meet the needs of the occupiers of the host dwelling. Moreover, I saw that the proposed additional access would allow vehicles to park on the driveway unimpeded by the garage, preventing the need for complex manoeuvres. Consequently, and notwithstanding the size of the garage, adequate parking with suitable access would be provided by the proposal.
7. Turning to the length of the driveway fronting the garage, this would be significantly below the required space to park a vehicle. The Council refer to the Wales Parking Standards (2014) that require driveways to be 6m long where they front a garage. This is to allow adequate parking space including access to the garage. As such, whilst there is some dispute between parties regarding the dimensions, it is clear to me that the length of the driveway to the front of the garage would be considerably below the 6m standard.
8. The appellant states the driveway in front of the garage would be around 4.1m and, accounting for the footway, that there would be approximately 5.4-5.7m between the garage and the road. Highway safety concerns apply to all users, including drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians using the footway. The limited driveway length would result in a vehicle projecting onto the footway when parked or accessing the garage, causing an obstruction to pedestrians, including wheelchair users, people with pushchairs, and those with visual impairments. Taking the distance provided by the appellant, it is likely that a vehicle would block the entire footway and even extend somewhat into the road. By obstructing the footway, this would force people into the road without warning to drivers. Notwithstanding the new access, given the convenience of the existing drop kerb access directly from the highway, I consider that on occasion, occupiers or visitors would be encouraged to park in the space in front of the garage. I note that a small vehicle may be able to reverse into the garage from within the site, however, for the reasons given above the development as proposed would result in a risk of harm to pedestrian safety and the safe and efficient operation of the highway.
9. Although the occupant's current vehicle may be smaller than a standard vehicle, the development's future use must be considered, such as a change of vehicle or change in occupier. Therefore, I do not consider the current vehicle dimensions justify a departure from the adopted highway standards.
10. I accept that parking is available on the driveway to the side of the garage and note that the appellant intends to use the garage for domestic storage and occasional parking of a classic vehicle. However, because the existing access is being retained, there would be nothing to prevent current or future occupiers parking in front of the garage. A condition restricting parking in such a manner would not be reasonable or enforceable.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a driveway within the estate where its limited length has resulted in vehicles projecting onto the footway, however this only reinforced my concerns relating to a footway obstruction. Other driveways and garages may pre-date current standards, obtained consent under different policy contexts or have been approved based on different site circumstances. Their presence does not create a precedent, nor would this justify the harm I have identified in this case.
12. Therefore, whilst the internal dimensions of the garage are not considered to result in an adverse impact on parking provision, the hardstanding fronting the garage would be

significantly below the requirements provided in the Wales Parking Standards, resulting in material harm to highway safety.

1. I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to highway safety with regard to the safe and effective use of Heol Y Glyn and would therefore conflict with Policy SW11 of the Merthyr Tydfil Local Development Plan which seeks to ensure that accesses and traffic movements would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would satisfy the Council's parking standards.

Conclusion

2. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
3. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives.

T Leck

INSPECTOR