



Appeal Decision

by Zoe Baxter BSc, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 19/03/2024

Appeal reference: CAS-03185-Q9M3V6

Site address: 5 Fort View, Basseleg, Newport, NP10 8PF

- 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 Romuald Skoczylas against the decision of Newport City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0970 dated 26 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of two storey side extension.
 - A site visit was made on 5 March 2024.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling of similar design to neighbouring properties along Fort View. The site and adjacent properties to the east of Fort View are situated at a lower level than the road, albeit are still visible between the front boundary treatments. The dwellings are situated in a uniform row with a strong building line and generous intervals between properties. The two-storey side extension would replace the existing single storey extension, extending out an additional 2m in width.
4. Policy GP6 of the adopted Newport Local Development Plan (LDP) states new development should appropriately reflect the scale of adjacent townscape and care should be taken to avoid over scaled development and avoid the replication of neighbouring architectural styles. The Council's House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) advises two storey extensions should be set down from the main roof and in most cases, side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the front elevation of the original building and be set in at least 1m from the side boundary of the property.
5. Although finished differently with a mix of materials, the site and adjoining dwelling 7 Fort View (no.7) retain a balanced and symmetrical appearance in terms of property widths and fenestration placement fronting the street. This is evident in many properties along the street with few exceptions that have not unduly altered the context that I have described. The width of the proposed extension would take the two-storey frontage of the

property to 10m, a significant increase that would disproportionately elongate the appearance of the front elevation of the appeal property. The scale of the proposal would also be exacerbated by the height and design of the proposed extension. The lack of set back and set down from the main dwelling, as advised by the SPG, would result in the extension not appearing subordinate. Instead, it would be a visually dominant addition that would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposal would therefore fail to respect the scale and appearance of the semi-detached pair resulting in an intrusive and unsympathetic addition to the dwelling.

6. The proposed extension would also reduce the space to the side of the property, thereby reducing the void between built development. The appellant refers to there being ample space between the site and the neighbour 3 Fort View (no. 3). However, this is below the SPG's advice of at least a 1m gap between side extensions and the boundary. In this case, the reduction would be clearly noticeable given the generous intervals between properties and would compromise the meaningful gap between the site and no. 3 to the detriment of the street scene.
7. Reference is made in the submissions to similarly designed extensions permitted at nos. 14 and 16 Fort View. Both were approved under previous iterations of local policy, with the extension at no. 14 permitted in excess of 20 years. I note that the extension at no. 16 was approved at appeal and I have had regard to this decision. However, this decision was made in the context of the adjoining property having a similarly sized side extension flush with the front elevation and the appeal scheme would seek to regain an element of symmetry. As such, the circumstances of that appeal are not comparable to the scheme before me.
8. Similarly, other examples are referred to at Penlan Close and 8 Highfield Road, which I observed during the site visit. However, none of these decisions have had any visual influence on the immediate context of the appeal proposal which I have therefore determined on its merits.
9. I conclude that the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy GP6 of the LDP and the objectives of the SPG.

Other Matter

10. Planning Policy Wales requires the submission of a green infrastructure statement with all planning applications. The purpose of a green infrastructure statement is to enhance the quality of the built environment by integrating green infrastructure into development through appropriate site selection and use of creative design. The proposed demolition of a single storey side extension and erection of a two-storey side extension offers no opportunities to integrate green infrastructure. Consequently, I do not consider the absence of a green infrastructure statement weighs against the proposed development.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.
12. 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.

Zoe Baxter

INSPECTOR