



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/19/3228074

70 Tattershall, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN5 8BX

- 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 Marshall against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/HOU/19/0142/CHHO, dated 10 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Erection of two storey front, single storey front, first floor side and rear, plus single storey rear extensions.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. I have used the slightly amended description of development provided by the Council for accuracy and clarity, which was also used by the appellant in Section E of the appeal form.

Main Issues

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. Tattershall is a road that is part of a wider modern housing estate and wider suburban area located on the south western outskirts of Swindon. The estate is a pleasant, quiet development which is characterised by mostly two storey traditionally designed detached dwellings, of similar scale and design, with off road parking and integral garages. There is some variety in design provided by single storey front projections and some hipped roofs, however, there is a clear and consistent architectural character apparent.
6. The appeal property is located prominently on a corner of the road close to the junction with Bodiam Drive and set above the highway level. The new two storey front extension would introduce a dominant and prominent 2 storey gable feature on this attractive property which would be out of keeping with, and harmful to its character appearance. Furthermore, the amount and scale of

extensions proposed would, when taken as a whole, significantly alter the character and appearance of the property by engulfing the host property, detracting from its architectural character. The presence of mature vegetation within the gardens to the property does not mitigate the harm that would be caused.

7. Given the harm that I have identified, the contribution that the extended property would make to the character and appearance of the area would be significantly diminished, and the proposal would dilute the quality of the environment along Tattershall.
8. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, in conflict with Policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (adopted 2015), which requires development to be of a high standard of design and demonstrate an understanding of the existing built characteristics of an area. There would also be conflict with the guidance contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions and Alterations (adopted 2011) which, amongst other matters, requires extensions to be subordinate to and in keeping with the character of the main house and not result in a dominant or discordant element (paragraph 2.22). The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 127) which requires development to be sympathetic to local character, visually attractive and add to the overall quality of an area.
9. The personal circumstances of the appellant is noted, including his desire to provide space for his growing family. I note also the reference to a similar front extension located nearby at No 36 Bodiam Drive. However, I have limited information before me in respect of this development and the circumstances leading to planning permission being granted. In any event, I observed that the context of this development is not directly comparable to the proposal before me. I have considered the proposal on the merits of the case and these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified and the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR