



Appeal Decision

by Richard James Bsc (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 17/01/2024

Appeal reference: CAS-03050-Y2Y8Y2

Site address: 19 Broadmead, Killay, Swansea, SA2 7EE

- 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 Mr Terwyn Williams against the decision of the City and County of Swansea Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/1724/FUL, dated 11 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is an attached side extension, installation of side door and fenestration alterations.
 - A site visit was made on 30 November 2023.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For completeness, I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice and the Appeal Form.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached two storey dwelling that fronts onto Broadmead near its junction with Kennington Close, which runs adjacent to the appeal site's side boundary. The dwelling sits on a lower ground level than Broadmead, although its corner siting affords it visual prominence within the street scene. Views of the appeal site's front, side and rear elevations are available from the adjacent footway, with the land continuing to slope down to the rear along Kennington Close. The property forms part of a wider residential frontage of predominantly semi-detached dwellings which, whilst of modest architectural merit, are largely consistent in scale, form and proportions to give a pleasing uniform appearance along the southern side of Broadmead. Despite the presence of differently styled semi-detached dwellings across Broadmead opposite the site, the street scene also largely maintains consistent spacings between dwellings and their side boundaries on both sides.
5. The dwelling benefits from a previously approved two-storey side extension (Ref. 2022/2748/FUL), off which a new single storey lean-to storage area would extend up to the side boundary.

6. Policy PS 2 of the adopted Swansea Local Development Plan 2010-2025 (LDP), amongst other matters, requires development to respond positively to aspects of local context and character that contribute towards a sense of place. In support of LDP policy, Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) set out in the adopted 'Placemaking Guidance for Householder Development' advises that amongst other matters, side extensions should not upset the form and balance of the original front elevation and as a guide they should be no greater than one half the frontage width of the original house.
7. The proposed single storey addition would continue from the approved two storey extension's front and rear elevation building lines and would be of similar materials. In doing so, it would significantly elongate the front and rear elevation widths far beyond half the original dwelling's width, with little visual relief. It would as such, compete visually with the original dwelling's width. Although sited on lower ground when viewed from the front, the single storey extension would still be clearly visible from both front and rear public views. Whilst the lean-to section would be set clearly below the approved extension's roof and is itself of minimal size, the cumulative impact of this addition would result in a dwelling that would occupy the majority of its plot width. Consequently, it would have an overly expansive and incongruous appearance in comparison to the other dwellings along Broadmead, which are commonly set in from their side boundaries.
8. I acknowledge that the approved two-storey extension would be greater than half of the original dwelling's frontage width. However, the exceedance would be marginal and would not unbalance the dwelling's front and rear elevations, or the overall appearance of the semi-detached pair. The appeal proposal would increase this exceedance to a significant and harmful extent. These effects would not be effectively mitigated through the use of high quality materials.
9. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to LDP Policy PS 2 and the design objectives of the Placemaking Guidance for Householder Development SPG.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.
11. 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.

Richard James

INSPECTOR