
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/22/3291247

9 Ermin Close, Baydon, Marlborough SN8 2JQ

- 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 Dr James Lawrence against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2021/07631, dated 15 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension to the north elevation of the current property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey extension to the north elevation of the current property at 9 Ermin Close, Baydon, Marlborough SN8 2JQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2021/07631, dated 15 July 2021, 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 following approved plans: 1:1250 scale location plan, 1:250 scale block plan, Existing Elevation, Existing Floor Plan (Sheets 1 and 2), Proposed elevation for double storey extension and Proposed Floor Plan (Sheets 1 and 2).
 - 3) All external materials to be used in the works hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The existing property is a two-storey, detached dwelling. The property is set within an estate of detached properties, but there is considerable variety in the design, scale and siting of neighbouring buildings, including both single and two-storey dwellings, some arranged with gables facing the road, some with roof ridges running perpendicular to the road. There is also a mixture of brick finished properties and rendered elevations. It is also evident that many of the surrounding properties have been altered and extended.
4. The appeal scheme proposes the addition of an extension to the front elevation of the property, with a roof hipped away from the road. While this would

protrude forward of the building line of properties on this side of the estate road, there would remain an acceptable setback from the edge of the footway, ensuring that the extension would not be oppressive on the street. In this respect, it would mirror the arrangement of a forward-projecting extension to a property on the opposite side of the road, albeit that is a single storey addition. Furthermore, given the considerable variety of properties that can be seen in the surrounding area, consistency is no longer a defining feature of dwellings in the area and thus a front addition would not be incongruous at this location.

5. The width of the proposed extension would not be such that it would result in the proposal appearing overly dominant, I observed that a neighbouring property had been extended to the side with a forward-facing gable remaining. Alongside this development, I consider that the appeal proposal would not appear overly bulky.
6. I therefore find that the proposal would integrate acceptably with the surrounding development and would not be discordant with the existing property. As such, there would be no harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area or the host building. Accordingly, I find that the appeal scheme would comply with core policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, insofar as it seeks to ensure that development responds to existing townscape features to effectively integrate with a setting. The scheme would also comply with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. The Council has referred to conflict with the National Design Guide but has not identified the specifics of any conflict. In the absence of such details, I have found the scheme accords with the policy referred to above.

Other Matters

8. I note comments in respect of parking provision at the site, in that there is a single parking space at this time. While I note the appellants comments that an additional space is to be created, the Council has not suggested any planning condition requiring this. Given the lightly trafficked nature of the road, I have no reason to find that on-street parking at this location would be problematic and thus find that the scheme would not result in any detriment to highway safety or inconvenience to road users.

Conditions

9. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed a plans condition and in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition in respect of the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR