
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/W/19/3228847

61 Windrush, Highworth, Swindon SN6 7DT

- 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 Mrs R Foster against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/19/0166/CHHO, dated 31 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2019.
 - The development is a proposed dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property currently comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling with a moderately sized side and rear garden. It forms part of a long row of terrace dwellings with a consistent design, finish and rhythm, fronting onto a large open space area. The pattern of terrace dwellings is a feature of the surrounding area. This consistent pattern of residential development results in an open character and appearance along Windrush with uninterrupted views down towards St Michael's Avenue.
4. The proposed erection of a new end of terrace dwelling would extend the physical and visual bulk of the terrace row in the street scene. The resulting effect would harm the sense of openness. I note that several end of terrace dwellings have side extensions. However, in contrast to the appeal proposal these extensions are single storey in design and appear subordinate, preserving the openness of the street scene. As a consequence of the proposal's siting and height this would result in a harmful sense of enclosure within the street scene.
5. The width of the proposed dwelling would also harm the character and appearance of the terrace. Each terrace dwelling presents a consistent width and pattern of fenestration towards the open space area, which visually defines a rhythm for this grouping of dwellings. In comparison, the proposal would appear cramped and awkward within this setting. I note that the proposed design intends to use the same building materials, finishes and window style to

those present on the existing terraces. However, in my judgement this would not overcome the disruption which the proposed dwelling would have on the pattern and rhythm of the terrace. Similarly, the pattern of front gardens for each terrace contributes to the same sense of continuity. The loss of the front garden for off-street parking would harm the established character and appearance.

6. The appellant submitted several photographs of extensions that have taken place on the end of terraces. However, these are not directly comparable to the proposed development because they show a wide variety of different extension types on dwellings with a different form to the appeal property. The appellant has also noted that the rear garden for the proposed dwelling would be comparable to neighbouring properties. Based on the plans provided and my observations during the site visit I do not consider this to be the case. Irrespective, the size of the rear garden does not outweigh the sense of enclosure on Windrush, or the disruption to the pattern and rhythm of the terrace which would result from the appeal proposal.
7. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (adopted 2015), the Swindon Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2016), and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure development is designed to a high standard and which takes into account the context and character, in respect of existing built characteristics.

Other Matters

8. A submission was received from the Highworth Town Council in favour of the proposed development. There was also no objection from the Highway Authority regarding the proposed off-street parking location. These representations are noted but do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR