
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2020

by S. Rennie BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/19/3240751

46 Shaftesbury Road, Wilton, Wiltshire SP2 0DR

- 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 Andy Price against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/08190/FUL, dated 23 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a second floor extension to create home office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Andy Price against Wiltshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the wider street scene area.

Reasons

4. Shaftesbury Road is a long residential street near the centre of Wilton. There are a variety of house types evident, from thatched cottages to modern style houses. The houses along this road appear to mainly have two full storeys, though many have dormers or windows within gables which suggest living accommodation within their roof structures.
5. The house at No 46 Shaftesbury Road is a two storey house in an 'L' shape which has a distinct appearance from other houses in this street. The proposal is to create the additional living accommodation by adding a third storey to the rear section of the house. To keep the height of the extended dwelling down the eaves are lowered from that previously submitted to the Council, which results in a form of 'half-dormer' to the front elevation, where the two second-floor windows 'break' the eaves line.
6. The design of the extension, even with the low eaves line, would result in a much more prominent house which would appear more as almost a full three storey dwelling, emphasised more by its additional height over the front two storey section which is to remain as it is. The three storey section would be set back but would still be clearly visible as part of the street scene. As the

prevailing character of the street is two storey dwellings (often with dormers of gable windows to provide the possibility of living accommodation within the roof structure) this proposed extension at No 46 would appear out of keeping as its eaves level is close to full three storey height.

7. I recognise that the ridge height with the proposed extension would be lower than the houses to either side, but both appear clearly as two storey houses. Their height above No 46 is partly due to the higher ground level in which they are positioned, especially for the house to the east of the site. Therefore, the proposal would still appear as a three storey house (albeit with a low eaves level) between two storey houses.
8. It is noted that the overall height of many of the properties are roughly similar, though with No 46 being lower. However, considering that No 46 is on a lower ground level than many and is a two storey property, I do not regard its lower height compared with other dwellings along this side of Shaftesbury Road as detrimental to the street scene. Yet, I do regard the proposed additional storey to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, as explained above.
9. The inclusion of lower eaves levels for the extension results in the previously mentioned half-dormers, where the windows 'break' the eaves line. The windows proposed with these dormers are large and would be prominent on the front elevation when seen from the street. However, the prevailing type of dormer within this street, of which there are many, are the more traditional style dormer wholly within the roof slope and also of a modest scale. The half-dormer type proposed would be out of keeping with this prevalent style and therefore would be an incongruous and feature within the street scene, adding to the prominence of the extension also.
10. The proposed extension to provide an additional storey of accommodation would be significant in scale in relation to the existing dwelling, changing its appearance and proportions substantially. Nevertheless, this dwelling is not of particular design merit and nor does it have a positive impact within the street scene. In my view, it is the impact to the street scene where the dwelling with the proposed additions would be both out of keeping and more prominent within its setting which would be more detrimental than the impact to the appearance of the house itself.
11. Whilst I have regard to other aspects of the scheme, such as the use of matching materials, which attempt to design a more appropriate extension for this additional storey, the result would be an incongruous development as a result of a combination of both the additional storey and the use of prominent half-dormers, as explained above. This proposal would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and so would be contrary to policy 57 (particularly parts i, iii and vi) of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy. This policy seeks to require development to enhance local distinctiveness, respond positively to existing townscape features, taking into account the local context, amongst other things.
12. With regards to the National Planning Policy Framework, I do not regard the proposal as being in accordance with the clear expectations in plan policies relating to design. Furthermore, paragraph 130 states that "*Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities*

available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions..”

13. In this case, the proposal would not improve the character and quality of the area and so would not be in full accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Rennie

INSPECTOR