



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 3 February 2021

by **S Edwards BA MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/20/3264709

26 Moberly Road, Salisbury SP1 3BY

- 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 Rory Heatley against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/05729, dated 9 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Ground floor side and rear extension and first floor rear extension (resubmission of 19/04660/FUL)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background

2. The appeal is part retrospective, as the development for which the appellant is seeking planning permission has been largely constructed. It includes the erection of single storey additions to the side and rear of the dwellinghouse, as well as a first floor rear timber-clad extension with flat roof, which presently protrudes above the eaves level of the host dwelling.
3. The Council has refused planning permission¹ for the retention of the extension in its current built form. A subsequent application² seeking to replace the flat roof of the first floor extension with a dual pitched roof, and the cladding with render has however been recently granted. As part of the current proposal, the flat roof element of the first floor addition would be replaced with a crown roof, and the timber cladding to the rear elevation of the extension is proposed to be retained, whilst the side elevations would be rendered. I shall determine the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, and the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a two-storey detached dwelling located within an established residential area, which displays a variety of building styles. Notwithstanding this, properties generally share a similar palette of materials and features, are typically set back from the road frontage and follow a

¹ Local Planning Authority Reference 18/11540/FUL.

² Local Planning Authority Reference 19/04660/FUL.

- consistent front building line. These considerations give the locality a cohesive and pleasant, traditional, suburban character.
6. The depth and width of the extension have been considered acceptable as part of the scheme which has been previously approved by the Council, and there are no reasons for me to take an alternative view in this respect. However, the appeal proposal would, by reason of its roof form, fail to reflect the design and the proportions which define the host property, and harmfully detract from its character and appearance. The introduction of a crown roof feature would do little to mitigate the harm caused by the excessive size of the flat roof element.
 7. The harm caused by the current proposal would be exacerbated by the retention of the timber cladding across the entire width of the rear elevation, which gives it a boxy appearance and, as a result, stands out as an alien and incongruous addition. To the difference of the scheme previously approved by the Council, the resulting development would thus fail to strike an appropriate balance with the existing fabric and integrate satisfactorily with the existing property, but also its immediate surroundings.
 8. Although there would be glimpses of the proposed scheme within the street scene, it would not be widely noticeable in public views. Notwithstanding this, the extension would be highly visible from neighbouring properties along Moberly Road and Ridgeway Road, not only because of its boxy appearance and the present finish of the cladding, but also the topography in this area. Despite the proposed changes, the extension would appear as a visually intrusive addition to neighbouring occupiers of the development, which would adversely affect their enjoyment of their outdoor amenity space in particular.
 9. The use of render to the side elevations of the extension would not overcome my concerns, notably because the harm resulting from its detailed design and retention of cladding would still be visible from the gardens of the properties either side of the appeal site, and those fronting Ridgeway Road.
 10. The appellant has referred to two planning applications which have been approved by the Council at nos 28 and 33 Moberly Road, noting, amongst other things, that properties along the road vary in design. However, I am not certain, having regard to the nature of these particular schemes and the conclusions drawn by the Council, that these approvals are relevant to the appeal proposal.
 11. The appellant's submissions include a number of photographs showing the use of cladding and other contemporary materials in the area, although limited information has been presented regarding each of the properties. That said, the use of cladding tends to be more restrained and understated than in respect of the appeal proposal.
 12. Furthermore, my attention has been drawn to an appeal decision³ related to the erection of a contemporary extension to the rear of a Victorian villa in Hove. Other than the decision itself, I do not have the details of the circumstances which led to the appeal being allowed, and cannot draw any direct parallels with the scheme before me. There are many examples across the country where contemporary extensions have been successfully added to

³ APP/Q1445/W/15/3017322.

historic properties, but in my view, this is not the case of the appeal scheme which I am required to determine.

13. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would unacceptably affect the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Due to its visual impact, it would also be detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would therefore conflict with the design aims of Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
14. The Council's Creating Places design guide (adopted 2006) predates the adoption of the Core Strategy and the publication of the Framework, and does not form part of the development plan. Nevertheless, it acts as a helpful guide to ensure that development proposals are of a high quality, which is consistent with the aims of national and local planning policy. It is also of note that this document has been subject to public consultation. On the basis of these considerations, I see no reasons why the Council's design guide should not be afforded significant weight, and find that the appeal scheme would also fail to accord with this document.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR