

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/W/16/3153343

41 Rycote Close, Grange Park, Swindon SN5 6AP

- 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 Jalil Ansari against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/15/1846/IH, dated 4 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2016.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of 1.no single dwelling on land to the side of 41 Rycote Close.
-

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 site is situated within a residential estate comprising a variety of building forms. 41 Rycote Close is situated towards the northern end of a terrace of 4no dwellings which includes modestly staggered ridgelines, and with the front elevation of 35 Rycote Close set further forward than the rest of the terrace.
4. Whilst the proposed ridgeline of the new dwelling would match that of the donor dwelling, its front and rear elevations would be set back significantly behind it which would give the proposal an air of incongruence in terms of the way it would appear within the street scene when compared with its adjacent neighbours. The amount of rear garden proposed for the new dwelling, demarcated as a patio and abutting the attached garage serving 43 Rycote Close to the rear, would be very limited in depth. In addition, a constrained garden area would be provided to the side, situated between the flank wall of the proposed dwelling, the existing close-boarded boundary fence, and the proposed parking area. In totality, these elements would give the proposal a cramped appearance which I consider would signify an over-development of the plot, being out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the locality.
5. The provision of a blank window at ground floor level on the front elevation of the proposed dwelling would also be at odds with the fenestration of the rest of the terrace, although on its own this would not be a reason to withhold granting

planning permission, it would add to the overall incongruity of the proposal within the street scene.

6. However, I am not convinced that the proposal would materially harm the outlook from the dwellings to the north west of the site, notwithstanding the harm stemming from it upon the visual amenities of the area. I also acknowledge that the submitted plans are functional and may be practical to build, but they do not amount to good design overall, although I agree that the proposal would not be overbearing or cause any inconvenience to any existing dwellings within the locality. It would also provide sufficient off-street parking to serve the proposed dwelling.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposal would give rise to an overdevelopment of the site, and would cause significant harm to the rhythm and appearance of the existing terrace of properties of which it would form part, and to the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal is contrary to Policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (2015) which requires a high standard of design for all types of development; requires proposals to address the objectives of sustainable development and requires proposals to be assessed against a number of design principles, including context and character in respect of existing built characteristics and the layout, form and function of development.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR