

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2017

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/16/3164880

18 Lampard Terrace, Wilton, Wiltshire SP2 0LB

- 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 Davidson & Miss Lisett against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 16/08115/FUL, dated 16 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear ground floor extension and front first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a front first floor extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear ground floor extension and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear ground floor extension at 18 Lampard Terrace, Wilton, Wiltshire SP2 0LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/08115/FUL, dated 16 August 2016 and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they show the erection of a rear ground floor extension only: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250, Site Layout Plan at scale 1:500 and Drg Nos: 16064/1, 16064/3, 16064/4, 16064/5 and 16064/6

Main Issue

2. The Council has no objection to the erection of the proposed ground floor rear extension. I have no reason to disagree given its modest size and appropriate design and appearance. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed front first floor extension upon the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced, two-storey dwelling dating from around the 1970s by my estimate and set within a wider residential estate comprising properties of broadly similar design and appearance. A notable feature of the area is the overtly linear form of the buildings, exaggerated by the length of the terraces, their open plan and exposed frontages, and the horizontal proportions to the dwellings' windows and front porches. Despite there being little architectural quality to the general form of the dwellings, there is a distinct uniformity to their design which portrays a regular and regimented character to the appearance of the terraces and wider area more generally.
4. The proposal includes a first floor, flat roof addition over the existing single-storey entrance hall to the front. In support of the proposal the appellants point to a similar extension, slightly further along the terrace at No 28. In that case planning permission was granted following a planning application that was made in 2004 (Ref: S/2004/2616).
5. I can understand why the appellants' have sought to use the permitted example at No 28 to try to inform how best to extend the limited size of their first floor living accommodation. However, the front extension to No 28 is the only example of such an addition within the entire estate. Moreover, notwithstanding the fact that it was lawfully built with the benefit of a planning permission, to my mind it stands out as an ill-conceived addition that introduces an awkward vertical component to the dwelling that is incongruous within an otherwise largely uniform and horizontally aligned terrace and which is out of context within its wider surroundings.
6. The appeal proposal would repeat an unsympathetic design which shows little respect for the composition of the terrace or its setting. In this regard I find that the front first floor extension would conflict with the aims and objectives of the current and up-to-date Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy Adopted January 2015. This seeks to secure a high standard of design in all new developments, consistent with a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given, I conclude that the front first floor extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. However, consistent with the Council's view, I find no harm from the proposed ground floor rear extension and no conflict from this part of the proposal with the development plan. As the two parts of the appeal proposal are clearly severable I shall issue a split decision. The appeal therefore fails with regard to the front first floor extension but succeeds in relation to the ground floor rear extension, subject to a condition that specifies the relevant drawings in order to provide certainty.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR