

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/16/3159986

8 Philip Road, Wilton SP2 0JJ

- 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 & Mrs B Morgan against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 16/05094/FUL, dated 20 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extensions and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey extension on the character and appearance of 8 Philip Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is part of a large residential estate that is positioned on a steep hillside. Constructed from brick under a tiled roof, 8 Philip Road is one half of a semi-detached pair of two storey dwellings. To both sides of the road there are similarly styled and aged semi-detached houses, set back behind comparable sized front gardens. The repeated simple architectural style and form of the semi-detached and terraced houses at Philip Road, along with the rhythmical spacing between them, gives a cohesive appearance to this part of the estate.
 4. The proposed two storey extension would be a large and dominating addition to No 8. The size of the extension, combined with the continuance of the height of the ridge and the absence of any set back from the front elevation would make it an overwhelming addition to the pair of semi-detached houses. It would unbalance the semi-detached pair giving an undue dominance to No 8, that because of the cohesive nature of this part of the estate would be unacceptably prominent.
 5. The appellants prefer the clean continuous lines of the extension, considering the existing and proposed roofs would have a seamless appearance. However, the resultant long and unbroken length of the roof would be harmfully conspicuous and particularly noticeable within the surrounding area due to the steeply sloping hillside. Whilst there are terraced houses nearby, the proposed
-

- extension would extend a pair of semi-detached houses, and as such would not have the planned homogenous appearance of the terraces.
6. The wide eaves of the proposed rear two storey extension would project incongruously beyond the flank wall. The discordant appearance of this would be a jarring detail at odds with the simple architectural style and form of the host and nearby dwellings. Furthermore, the proposed fenestration would have a horizontal emphasis rather than the vertical one found in No 8 and the other semi-detached houses. This difference would fail to respect the repeated fenestration that forms an integral characteristic of the estate.
 7. The appellants refer to the proposed use of brick to match the existing, with the transition being masked by a downpipe. But I am not convinced a downpipe would be wide enough to achieve this, and even if it could, there would be a noticeable difference between the weathered brickwork of the host building compared to the new brick of the extension.
 8. I have considered the concerns of the Council that the grant of planning permission would set a precedent for other similar developments within the estate. Whilst I have had regard to this matter, each application and appeal must be treated on its individual merits, in accordance with the requirements of the current development plan and all other material considerations.
 9. The main parties have explained that a revised scheme for extending the appeal property has been granted planning permission. Neither party has provided the full details of this approval, but the Council have stated that the scheme has a lower ridge height, a set back to the front elevation, and revised fenestration. Having regard to these stated differences the permitted scheme is therefore different to that before me, and as it is not a direct comparison to the appeal proposal, this limits the weight I can attribute to it.
 10. Taken as a whole the size and design of the two storey extension would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of No 8 and the surrounding area. The proposal would fail to accord with an objective of the National Planning Policy Framework that requires development to respect the local character and distinctiveness of an area. It would not be the high standard of design that enhances local distinctiveness required by Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015), nor would it comply with the principles of the Council's design guidance, *Creating Places* (2006). The appellants have also brought to my attention the Council's *Householder Design Guide*. The status of this document has not been provided and this limits the weight I can attribute it, nor has the Council referred to it in their consideration of the case. Nevertheless, having regard to its objectives, the appeal scheme would fail to comply with the design guidance it contains.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR