
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2017

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/17/3177845
75 Avonmead, Swindon, SN25 3NY

- 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 C Lewis against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/HOU/17/0395/CHHO, dated 3 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Avonmead and accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The surrounding area is largely residential and I observed that there is a range of dwelling types and architectural styles in the immediate area, which includes detached, semi-detached and bungalows. The proposal would result in the construction of a two storey side extension. The proposed extension would have an angled front and side wall, with the side wall following the angle of the eastern boundary of the appeal site. The ridge height of the proposed extension would be set down from the ridge height of the host dwelling and would be set back at first floor level.
4. The width of the proposed extension would be some 5 metres at its widest point. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (the SPD) sets out that side extensions should not be in excess of half the width of the host dwelling (Page 21). I consider that the Council's SPD is a material consideration of significant weight. The principal elevation of the host dwelling is approximately 6.6 metres in width. Consequently, the proposal would be well over the 50% guideline and would result in a very large addition to the host dwelling. Although there is an existing garage that largely has the same footprint as the proposed groundfloor part of the proposed extension and despite the setback and the step down in ridge height, the scheme would add significant bulk at first floor level to the host dwelling. I consider that the proposed extension by virtue of its scale and bulk would result in an overly large and dominant addition to the host dwelling that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

The proposed extension would be highly prominent in the street scene and due to its scale and bulk would appear as an overly dominant and unsympathetic addition.

5. The Council has raised concern with regard to the angled nature of the proposed extension, the roof form and the symmetry of the host dwelling with the neighbouring semi-detached property. However, given the presence of the existing angled garage, the curvature of the road, the building line of the neighbouring property to the east and the wide variety of architectural styles and layouts in the area, I do not share such concerns. However, this does not overcome my concerns with regard to the scale and bulk of the proposal.
6. In conclusion, the proposal, due to its scale and bulk would result in an overly large and dominant addition that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The scheme therefore runs contrary to Policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (2015). The policy seeks to ensure that new development is of high quality design and (amongst other things) respects the context and built characteristics of the area. Further, the proposal also conflicts with the SPD and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires good design.

Other matters

7. I accept that the proposal would not result in any harm to the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties and the materials of the proposed extension would match the host dwelling. I also acknowledge the letter of support for the scheme. However, these matters are not sufficient individually or in combination to overcome or outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the scheme conflicts with the development plan, when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR