

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/16/3161753
16 Marlborough Road, Salisbury, SP1 3TH

- 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 Neil Baker against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 16/05800/FUL, dated 3 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "*Change of an existing Permission to create a 1st floor space with a mansard (dutch barn) roof, above existing flat roofed garage/workshop*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, and upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at Nos 14 and 18 Marlborough Road, with particular regard to visual impact and privacy.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located within a fairly densely developed residential part of Salisbury. The reasonably long but narrow rear garden is typical for these properties and slopes upwards towards the rear with an existing flat roof garage/workshop building at the foot facing onto Woodstock Road. There is an array of different outbuildings to the rear of the Marlborough Road properties all along the west side of Woodstock Road. These are mostly single-storey structures but with some notable examples with steeply pitched roofs and fairly tall ridge heights, specifically the outbuildings to both adjoining plots at Nos 14 and 18. The opposite side of Woodstock Road is lined with terraced homes set behind deep front gardens and on considerably higher land levels.
-

4. The proposal is to add a first floor to the existing garage/workshop under a new mansard style roof. The eaves would be low, at typically single-storey height, and the ridge would compare favourably with the ridge heights to both adjoining buildings.
5. Despite the scale of the outbuildings at Nos 14 and 18, all the existing buildings along this side of Woodstock Road convey a sense of subservience in relation to their host dwellings. Even where it is clear that a building has space accommodated at first floor level it is obvious that this is achieved through utilisation of a roof void rather than giving any outright impression of a two-storey building.
6. In contrast, I find that the proposed mansard style roof would fail to mask the overtly two-storey form of the appeal building. The steeply pitched sides to the lower parts of the roof and the contrasting shallow pitches above would add considerable mass to the building overall at first floor level. This would be further exaggerated by the dormer windows that are proposed to one side such that overall I find that the building would look significantly larger in scale when compared with others along this side of Woodstock Road and incongruous within its back garden setting.
7. When viewed from the backs of the properties along Marlborough Road the existing outbuildings at the bottom ends of the gardens appear generally more prominent than their heights would normally otherwise suggest due to the rising land levels. Nevertheless, where buildings have pitched roofs their ridges run perpendicular to Woodstock Road. As a consequence, there is some respite within the outlook from the backs of these properties to each of these buildings' mass at first floor level due to the pitch of the roof and the space to each side. In my opinion this is important given the potential for these buildings to otherwise create an overly dominating and intrusive presence, particularly when seen from neighbouring plots.
8. In this case the two-storey scale of the appeal proposal would virtually fill the width of the plot. I find that this would be overly dominating and intrusive when viewed from the close confines of the neighbouring plots at Nos 14 and 18 Marlborough Road.
9. In addition, two windows are proposed at first floor level in the end elevation looking back towards No 16. Each of these would afford the opportunity to look directly over the neighbouring garden plots at only a shallow angle of deviation. In this case space immediately adjoining the rear elevations of Nos 14 and 18 would be open to clear view, as would the rear elevations themselves. This would have the potential to be seriously harmful and intrusive to the neighbouring occupiers' living conditions.
10. I recognise that the planning system should not attempt to impose architectural styles and that variety can be welcome in helping to define an eclectic urban environment. However, it is important to achieve this sensitively in any given situation. In this case I find that, due to its scale and bulk, the building would be harmful to the street scene and wider character of the area. Furthermore, the building would appear dominant and visually intrusive in the outlook from both neighbouring properties and the inclusion of windows to the rear elevation would lead to unacceptable levels of overlooking to both

adjoining plots. For these reasons I find clear conflict with Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy Adopted January 2015, which seeks to secure a high standard of design in all development and which compliments the locality.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR