

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2016

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/16/3153516

20 Crane Furlong, Highworth, Swindon SN6 7JX

- 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 K Gawthorn against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/16/0639/HC, dated 11 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is to change a flat roof to gable roof.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow set within a row of largely un-extended bungalows which are of a similar design. These comprise a flat roof front element, with a mono-pitched roof feature to the rear, the ridge line for which projects above the front flat roof and creates a modest first floor front elevation. On my site visit I noted that 2 Crane Furlong had undergone a roof extension, but this dwelling is situated at the end of the road and its front flat roof replaced with a pitched roof sloping from the original ridge towards and parallel with the road. Therefore, this is not directly comparable with the appeal proposal before me, but in any event each case must be assessed on its own merits.
4. The proposed new pitched roof would clearly amount to an extension, because it would involve extending the built form of the host property. I accept that it seeks to remove the existing flat roof area which has given rise to maintenance issues and would go some way in improving energy efficiency. Whilst in itself the proposal has some merit, it cannot be treated in isolation. The proposal would run counter to the relatively simple architectural composition of both the host dwelling and that of its neighbours, conflicting with the general architectural rhythm of the row as a whole. Therefore, the matters advanced in support of the proposal do not outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause upon the character and appearance of the street scene, running contrary to the prevailing of pattern of development within the locality.

5. From this basis I find that the proposal conflicts with Policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (2015) which requires high standards of design for all types of development and requires proposals to be assessed against a number of design principles, including context and character in respect of existing built characteristics. It also runs counter to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document entitled "Residential Extensions and Alterations (2011)" which advises that front extensions should not dominate the host dwelling or introduce a discordant or inharmonious element.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR