
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2020

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/20/3251585

26 Bibury Road, Old Walcot, Swindon SN3 1DD

- 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 Rokib Ali against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/HOU/20/0315/PEKO, dated 26 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of additional first floor accommodation over existing ground floor footprint.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of additional first floor accommodation over existing ground floor footprint at 26 Bibury Road, Old Walcot, Swindon SN3 1DD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/HOU/20/0315/PEKO, dated 26 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan – DCD 20/02/10.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those as set out in the submitted supporting details (application form).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

3. The house at No 26 Bibury Road is on a corner plot (with Upham Road) and is semi-detached. This is a residential area of Swindon, where there is predominantly semi-detached properties.
4. No 26 has already been extended to the side at two storeys with also a single storey double garage attached to the side extending along to the boundary with No 24 Bibury Road. The proposal would be to extend above the double garage to provide accommodation for a family member. Based on the information before me, this accommodation would provide this family member

their own separate space within the house, but I have not considered this as a wholly separate dwelling unit. From the information provided, I acknowledge the importance to the appellant and his family in providing this accommodation.

5. For clarity, the proposal includes a possible alternative which would provide a section of 'mono roofing' to the front elevation instead of the parapet. Following consultation with the parties it is this design with the mono roofing to the front elevation that I have considered and assessed with this appeal.
6. This corner plot is in a prominent position near the junction between Bibury Road and Upham Road. The extension would be a first floor addition which would be visible from the road. However, I would not regard this proposed extension as likely to be overly prominent or even dominant within the street scene, even on this corner plot location. The parapet roof would be no higher than the existing house rooflines and the scale of the proposal is not excessive for this location. In this context, I do not regard the proposal as dominant or overly prominent.
7. The extension would add to the side of the existing house, which would increase the visual difference with the semi-detached adjoining house, but there are already distinct differences between both properties which are not now completely symmetrical. However, it is clear what is the original dwellings before the extensions (including that now proposed) and they would still share a distinct character appropriate for a semi-detached pair.
8. The proposed extension would be built up to the side of No 24 Bibury Road, which has already extended up to the side boundary over two storeys. The Council is concerned that this would result in a terracing effect due to the width of the extension up to this boundary. In this regard I acknowledge the Council have an adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) entitled 'Residential Extensions and Alterations', which states that side extensions should extend no more than half the width of the principle elevation and also that terracing of properties is resisted.
9. Whilst I recognise the aims of this guidance, in this particular case the proposed extension would only close a gap which remains at first floor level. As such, from street level there are no clear views through the site other than skywards. As such, the loss of view through filling this gap is not detrimental to the street scene.
10. Furthermore, the extension would be set between the hipped roofs of both the host dwelling and the side of No 24. No 24 and 26 are also distinct in terms of the materials and finishes to both houses. As such, the proposed first floor accommodation would not result in these semi-detached houses appearing instead as a terrace row.
11. The extension would be wide, though it would taper towards the rear due to the corner plot dimensions of the site. In this regard, although wider than other extensions evident in the area, along Bibury Road for example, it would essentially build up to the side boundary which is much the same as some of these other extensions. As such, the proposal for an extension to build up to the side boundary over two storeys is not out of keeping with the current character of the street scene and the wider residential area. Furthermore, the proposed flat roof would be the same as the existing flat roof over the ground

floor currently. However, the section of mono-pitched roof as proposed to the front would also give the appearance of a pitched roof, especially from street level, which would reflect the hipped roof form characteristic of the area.

12. Overall, there would be no harm to the character and appearance of this street scene as a result of this proposed development. Any terracing effect would not be such that it would significantly alter the prevailing character of the streets that this site fronts.
13. For these reasons, the proposal would not harm either the character and appearance of the existing house or the surrounding streets and is therefore in accordance with policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 which requires development to be of a high quality design which respects existing building characteristics, amongst other things. Furthermore, the proposal is in general accordance with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the Framework. The conditions I have included have been subject to some alterations to improve clarity and ensure consistency with the Framework and PPG.
15. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance, which should be as per those set out on the application form/submitted details with this appeal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 1 above.

S. Rennie

INSPECTOR