



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on the 13 July 2021

by David Murray BA (Hons), DMS, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/W/21/3273530

77 York Road, SWINDON, SN1 2JR.

- 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 D Barber against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S/20/1581/CHHO, dated 7 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey end of terrace property which lies on the corner of York Road and Southampton Street. It is proposed to erect a dwelling attached to the side of the property and this would have three floors of accommodation, the upper floor in the roof space including a flat roof dormer window to the rear.
4. The site lies in a residential area where new development is generally acceptable subject to the effect on the locality as per Policy DE1 of the Council's Local Plan (2015). I note that planning permission was granted in 2015 under ref. S/15/1644/ CHHO for a full width single storey side extension at the property. This has not been built but is a material consideration.

Effect on character and appearance

5. The area around the appeal site is characterised by terraced housing sited close to the street, but I noted at my site visit that at corner sites the flank of properties generally continues the building line of the neighbouring street. This results in a slight gap of the end of the terraces from the road and the opportunity for some greenery in the street scene, as present at the appeal site and at No.75 on the opposite corner.
6. The terraced properties on the southern side of Southampton Street are set back from the road by a small hard surfaced space and front wall. Seen from along this street, the proposed dwelling would appear prominent and imposing as it would protrude beyond the established building line. From other views

around the appeal site, there would be noticeable reduction in the gap and the quality and openness of the space around the junction would be diminished. This would reduce the visual relief the space makes to an otherwise intensive form of residential development in the area.

7. I have taken account of the permitted single storey extension but this would not have the same degree of scale or prominence as the 2/3 storey building proposed and visually much of the gap would remain. Overall, I find that the proposed dwelling would harm the character and appearance of the street scene, particularly on a prominent corner site, and would not result in a development of a high quality design that respects the character and quality of the area. As a result the proposal conflicts with Policy DE1 of the development plan.

Other matters

8. A local resident also raises an objection to the proposal on highway grounds. I note that the highway authority do not object to the proposal and there are parking restrictions on the corner outside of the appeal site. As such, there is little evidence presented to demonstrate that the appeal proposal will make manoeuvres on the highway worse particularly for commercial vehicles. I am therefore unable to place much weight on this issue.

Planning balance

9. On the main issue I have found that that the proposed dwelling would harm the character and appearance of the area and would not accord with the requirements of the relevant policy in the development plan. This has to be balance with other positive factors. The additional residential unit would contribute to the mix of new dwellings in the area and to the genal supply of housing which the appellants says there is a shortage of in the borough. However, these general and limited benefits do not outweigh the local harm that I have identified and the conflict with the development plan and this indicates that the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR