



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 11 November 2020

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/20/3260259

35 Cricklade Street, Swindon, Wiltshire SN1 3HB

- 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 E Henty against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/HOU/20/0821/SASM, dated 26 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear single storey and 2 storey extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear single storey and 2 storey extensions at 35 Cricklade Street, Swindon, Wiltshire SN1 3HB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/HOU/20/0821/SASM, dated 26 June 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 approved plan numbered TD 13073/2.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Swindon Old Town Conservation Area (the CA) and whether it would preserve the setting of the grade II* listed building, Christ Church (the LB).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a small house in the middle of a row of buildings of various styles and sizes. By virtue of its age and positioning close to the road, the terrace hints at the area's history as one of the main routes into the old town and so contributes to the significance of the CA. The site is also close to the LB which gains its significance from its fine architectural features and historic role as an important community building.
4. The extensions would not be seen from the street and would not be prominent from the rear as they would be between the flank walls of buildings on either side. Also, the small flat roof element of the first floor extension would be generally hidden by the ridgeline of the proposed pitched roof and so it would not appear incongruous. The loss of the existing rear roof slope and elevation is of no significant consequence as they are of little architectural value and are

not widely visible. As it would be smaller and to the rear, the proposal would not dominate the existing house and it would be of a sympathetic design.

5. There would be very little inter-visibility between the development and the LB. Also, due to their size and positioning between existing buildings, the extensions would cause no meaningful loss of openness around the church.
6. For these reasons, I conclude the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and would preserve the setting of the LB. In this regard, it would accord with policies DE1 and EN10 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2015. Amongst other things, these policies aim to ensure development is of high quality design that respects the historic environment.

Other Matters

7. An adequate private garden would remain following construction of the development. The extensions would not cause overshadowing of any of the neighbouring properties' windows and would not lead to unacceptable direct overlooking. Given the scale of the development, it is unlikely that construction noise would cause unacceptable disturbance to the occupiers of nearby dwellings. Any damage caused to property during construction would be a private matter between the parties involved. In the absence of any substantive evidence to dismiss the appeal on any of the above grounds or complaints, the concerns raised do not override or affect my conclusions on the main issues.

Conditions

8. For reasons of certainty, I have attached a condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. There is no need for a condition regarding external materials as sufficient details have been provided.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR