



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2020 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/20/3253853

7 Rochester Close, Toothill, Swindon SN5 8JS

- 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 Chichanka Williams against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/HOU/20/0500/EMMI, dated 2 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of first floor side extension over the garage.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect that the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the existing property, its attached neighbour and the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. Rochester Close is part of a wider suburban residential estate made up of detached dwellings with attached and linked garages. The dwellings are very similar in appearance and scale and are designed so that a separation distance between the properties at first floor provides the characteristic visual gap of the wider development and helps provide a sense of openness.
5. The proposed extension would infill this gap and would extend close to the neighbouring property, No 6. Whilst sited at the end of a cul de sac, the appeal property and its neighbours is visible from Freshbrook Way to the rear, and even if the road side trees obscured the property from view, it would be clearly visible from the footpath by the road.
6. The extension would be set down from the ridge and back from the front elevation, in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (2011) (SPD). However, the SPD sets out that *'Proposals that only comply with minimum standards without ensuring high quality design and addressing context and character however, will not be*

acceptable.' The loss of the visual gap between the properties would be incongruous given the uniform design of the wider estate in this respect and would harm its existing open character in addition to altering the detached appearance of the property and its neighbour. The proposed 100mm lead sealed 'gap' between the properties would also not minimise the harmful effect.

7. I acknowledge that the development would provide the appellant with the additional space he requires and would not harm the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, this would be expected of any well-designed development and therefore carries little weight. Consequently, it does not outweigh the visual harm identified. The appellant also points to other examples of side extensions approved by the Council, however, does not detail these and as such, I cannot compare them with the development proposed.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property, its attached neighbour and the area, in conflict with Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (adopted 2015) (the Local Plan) Policy DE1, the SPD 'Residential Extensions & Alterations' and the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 127), which collectively seek to ensure that, amongst other criteria, proposals for development are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR