
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by Helen O'Connor LLB MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/20/3249516

15 Edwards Meadow, Marlborough SN8 1UL

- 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 B Iorio against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/11555/FUL, dated 3 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is for two storey rear and front extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In my heading above, I have taken the description of development used on the decision notice and appeal form rather than that on the original planning application form. The original description included a reference to a new boundary wall and gate which have since been omitted from the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Edwards Meadow comprises predominantly modern detached two-storey dwellings with open frontages incorporating landscaping. Whilst there is some variety in terms of the house type and materials, there is consistency in the massing of built form and plot size. Furthermore, where boundary walls are close to the street, there is evidence of the careful use of materials and detailing to add visual interest to the street scene. These factors contribute towards a pleasant residential character to the area.
5. 15 Edwards Meadow has a prominent position in the street scene due to its corner location and elevated level relative to the properties to the east, whereby its eastern side elevation and boundary wall are easily visible. Moreover, its well-proportioned front elevation faces onto grassed open space and can be seen in views from, and across this area. Its form, materials and detailing are consistent with the wider residential area and integrates well into its surroundings. Consequently, it makes a positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal would make a number of alterations to the front elevation that would have a negative and pronounced impact. Firstly, the existing first floor gable would project further forward. Secondly, the modest gabled dormer would be significantly enlarged. Thirdly, the ground floor storey would have a lean to roof element that would span the width of the dwelling emphasising a horizontal line. In combination, these factors would give the front elevation a bulky and disproportionate appearance. This harmful effect would be exacerbated due to its visibility in the wider street scene.
7. In addition, as two storey extensions are proposed at both the front and rear of the dwelling, the eastern side elevation would have an elongated appearance that would be particularly visible due to its proximity to the road. With only limited opportunities for detailing, the overall mass of the structure would be conspicuous. Taken together these factors would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Reference is made to other applications that have been approved by the Council, but as no examples or details are given this inhibits a comparison with the appeal proposal. Nevertheless, the Council indicate¹ that a limited number of such planning applications have been made and that these were all confined to the ground floor. It follows that they are unlikely to be of a similar scale and bulk to the proposal before me and therefore, are of limited weight.
9. The appellant highlights the existence of larger properties in Edwards Meadow. However, my observations were that these generally appeared to have been originally designed as such, rather than because of extensions. Accordingly, their appearance is not disproportionate or harmful and their presence would not lead me to a different view regarding the impact of the appeal proposal.
10. It is brought to my attention that during the course of the planning application, revisions were made to the original plans in response to concerns raised in the representations received. Nevertheless, this would not fully address, nor outweigh the harm identified in relation to the character and appearance of the area. In reaching my findings on the planning merits of the proposal, I have considered the entirety of the evidence submitted, including my own observations of the site.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, January 2015, which requires all new development to achieve a high quality design. This stipulates that, amongst other things, development should relate positively to its landscape setting and the existing pattern of development.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen O'Connor

Inspector

¹ Council's Case Officer Report, p14.