
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2016

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/16/3152893

4 Antrobus Road, Amesbury Wiltshire SP4 7NU

- 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 and Mrs Maple against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01468/FUL, dated 28 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposed dwelling upon the living conditions of the occupiers at the existing dwellings at No 4 and No 2 Antrobus Road with respect to outlook and enclosure of the gardens. The second is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal site is presently occupied by a semi-detached dwelling and also a large detached garage towards the rear, close to the boundary with No 6 Antrobus Road. The proposal is for a detached dwelling with the first floor living accommodation within the roof space. To enable the accommodation within the roof, there would be 2 dormers on the front and a single dormer in the rear. This would be in the position of the existing garage but further off of the boundary, covering a greater footprint and with a significantly higher roof.
 4. The rear elevation of the proposed dwelling would be close to the boundary with No 2 and the steep sloping roof would reach a similar height at the ridge to the neighbouring dwellings. This rear boundary is currently defined with a block wall that was above my head height but the dwelling would rise up much higher than that and the garage. As well as being lower, the gable end of the garage faces that rear boundary but the proposed dwelling would be oriented with the ridge parallel with the boundary. A greater amount of space above the level of the wall would be obstructed by the new structure. The tall building would therefore bring an increased sense of enclosure close to the boundary and a feeling of being hemmed in for those using to the adjoining garden area.
-

5. The existing garden at No 4 is enclosed by the boundary wall, by the existing single storey part of the dwelling and also the garage. The proposed dwelling and parking spaces would intrude into this main private part of the garden. The occupants of No 4 do however have a large amount of space around the side and front of the dwelling albeit close to the surrounding road. Privacy is secured around the front and side garden by the hedge and fence.
6. I am aware of the outline planning permission that exists for a single storey 3 bed detached bungalow for the site although have not been provided with those plans. However, a lower, single storey building would have less of an impact in these respects.
7. In relation to the first main issue, the proposed dwelling would have a harmful impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers at the dwelling at No No 2 Antrobus Road with respect to outlook and enclosure within the rear garden area. This would not comply with Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, adopted January 2015 (CS).

Character and appearance

8. The road frontage of Antrobus Road currently includes predominantly 2 storey dwellings linked together with single storey buildings. The site is a gap between a long line of similar dwellings and the back of No 4 which has a different layout on the corner of the road. The proposed dwelling with long roof slope and dormers would be different but would not harm the street-scene. The retained space on either side would be sufficient to prevent the dwelling from appearing cramped alongside the other dwellings and would replace the existing garage.
9. In relation to the second main issue, the proposed dwelling would have a satisfactory effect upon the character and appearance of the area that would comply in this respect with CS Core Policy 57.

Conclusion

10. My conclusion on the second main issue does not outweigh my conclusion on the first. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR