
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2019

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/W/19/3223205

43 Cullerne Road, Stratton St Margaret, Swindon SN3 4HU

- 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 Steve Lowes against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/18/1890, dated 20 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1 no. Dwelling on part land division.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I note correspondence from the appellant's agent regarding the Council's submission of a recent appeal decision for another site within the Borough. Given that it is common practice for previous appeal decisions to be submitted as evidence, I am satisfied that the appellant has not been prejudiced in this respect. The Appellant has also had an opportunity to comment on these within the Final Comments response.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Cullerne Road is a residential area which is characterised by dwellings with large rear gardens and a regular building line with properties facing towards the highway to the front. The proposed dwelling would be larger than the existing dwelling and would be squashed into the rear garden of the property, providing limited private garden space for both dwellings. Whilst, I note the appellant's assertion that the proposed private garden sizes would meet the Council's standard, the proposal would not reflect the local development pattern in this respect. The proposed layout would therefore be cramped backland development which would be at odds with the existing form of development in the area.
5. The proposed dwelling would include an awkward roof design, including both a hipped roof and a prominent gable design, which is not characteristic of the

area. Given that the site occupies a corner position at the entrance to the housing estate, the proposed dwelling would be highly visible from both Cullerne Road and Wanborough Road to the rear. The development would therefore harm the character and appearance of the streetscene in this respect.

6. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposed bungalow would include materials to match the existing dwelling, this would do little to mitigate the overall harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the site and the streetscene.
7. In conclusion, the proposal would represent overdevelopment which would be visually intrusive and harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore not accord with Policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (2015) (LP) which requires high standards of design in relation to the context, character, layout and form of a development. It would also be contrary to the Swindon Residential Design Guide (2016)(SRDG) which requires schemes to be designed to harmonise with the character of their surroundings and to make a positive contribution to the local area.

Other matters

8. I have considered other matters raised by the appellant's agent. I acknowledge that the site benefits from a sustainable location and that the proposed dwelling would provide accessible 'future proof' accommodation. However, these matters would not overcome the significant harm I have identified.
9. The appellant's agent has requested that I consider other two other developments in the area. However, given the limited information submitted in respect of these sites, as well as the fact that each scheme must be considered on its own merits, I have attached little weight to them in support of allowing the appeal. Similarly, the various appeal decisions merely demonstrate that every proposal has to be considered on its individual merits as inevitably every development differs in its nature and context.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would indicate that the appeal should be allowed. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR