



---

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 November 2021

**by Morgan Howell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: Wednesday 01 December 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/21/3282933**

**8 Leamington Grove, Swindon SN3 1NU**

- 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 T Corcoran against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
  - The application Ref S/HOU/21/1068/LZWI, dated 9 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2021.
  - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. There are no substantive changes relevant to the appeal before me and therefore no party would be prejudiced by me having regard to the 2021 version of the Framework.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. Leamington Grove is a residential cul-de-sac of predominately semi-detached two storey dwellings with bay windows and hipped roofs. No 8 Leamington Grove is semi-detached with a large side and rear garden, resulting in a noticeable visual gap to the side between No 8 and 7 Leamington Grove. There is a heavily landscaped area to the centre of the turning circle, however, the appeal site is still visible from wider vantage points on the Grove.
5. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling along with several other dwellings within the Grove have been extended. Despite the extensions, the scale and appearance of the host dwellings as well as the spaces in-between the properties at first floor have largely been maintained. This consistency of appearance as well as the appreciable spaces in-between contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The extension would double the width of the host dwelling at first floor, resulting in a dominant addition that would adversely impact upon the scale, massing, and appearance of the host dwelling. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling has been extended to the side, however, the proposed extension

would be noticeably wider, resulting in a visual imbalance between the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Although visual breaks have been proposed, the set back and down would not adequately mitigate the substantial width of the extension and its adverse impact upon the host dwelling and adjoining semi.

7. Furthermore, the width of the two-storey side extension would largely infill the visual gap between No 8 and No 7. Although a smaller gap would be retained, it would be out of rhythm with the built form and spaces within the Grove, which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. The adverse impact of the proposed extension would be exacerbated by the prominence of the appeal site from wider views on the Grove. I appreciate that the appeal site has a larger than average plot size, however, for the reasons set out, it does not mitigate the impact of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.
8. I, therefore, conclude that the impact of the extension on the host dwelling and adjoining semi, in combination with the loss of spacing in-between, would result in a proposal that would unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the area. As such, the scheme is contrary to DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2011, the Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and paragraph 134 of the Framework, which seek to ensure all new developments are of a good design and have a strong contextual response to sites.

### **Other Matters**

9. My attention has been drawn to properties which have been extended in the vicinity and may not comply with the guidance set out within the SPD. I do not have full details of these extensions and, therefore, I cannot make a direct comparison with the appeal proposal. In any case, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
10. I acknowledge that the representations from neighbours support the proposal. However, the level of support shown does not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Morgan Howell*

INSPECTOR