



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2022

**by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 13<sup>TH</sup> May 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/22/3292010**

**43 Stonehenge Road, Durrington, Salisbury SP4 8BP**

- 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 K Freemantle against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
  - The application Ref PL/2021/10976, dated 22 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2022.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension, demolition of an existing outbuilding and improvements to the existing dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the: -
  - character and appearance of the area, and host property.
  - living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties

### Reasons

3. No.43 is a modest, detached bungalow to the northwest side of Stonehenge Road. The area has a variety of properties, although, within the vicinity of the site they are primarily detached bungalows/chalet bungalows and the gaps between them permit views of the buildings in the road behind.
4. The appeal site has a splayed boundary with No.45, widening to the rear. The proposed extension would run adjacent to this side boundary and effectively extend from the bungalow to the rear of the garden. The single storey extension would have a mono pitched roof and would be linked to the host property via a flat roof element. To the east elevation (facing towards No.45) the height of the extension would be similar to the eaves on the existing bungalow, with a greater height to the west side (facing within the garden). The extension would have a depth greater than the width of the existing bungalow, which together with the height and massing of the extension would, in my view, create a disproportionate addition and would overwhelm the bungalow.
5. Due to the angled form of the extension, it would project beyond the side elevation of the bungalow and a significant depth would be visible in the street scene. Whilst the neighbouring property (No. 45) does have a row of outbuildings along this shared boundary these are smaller in scale, angled into

the site and are seen set against the rear elevations of the garages and dwellings in Pickneys Way. In contrast, the scale of the extension, which would also include a large chimney, would be a prominent feature and infill the gap between Nos. 43 & 45. In my opinion this would create an incongruous form of development, and together with the loss of spaciousness would be harmful to the character of the area.

6. I therefore find that the proposal would conflict with core policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS), which amongst other things, requires development to integrate into its setting and relates to the wider character of the area. It would also be contrary to the guidance contained within the Creating Places Design Guide which promotes extensions that are visually subservient to the original building and sympathetic in terms of design, scale, and proportions.

#### *Living Conditions*

7. The extension is extensive, nonetheless, it would be positioned parallel with the outbuildings within the garden of No.45. To the rear the end elevation is of a limited scale and would more or less align with the garage to No. 12 Pickney Way. Windows would be limited to the west elevation and boundary treatments restrict intervisibility. As such, I do not find that the single storey scale of the extension would have an overbearing impact or result in a material loss of amenity to the occupiers of the adjoining property, No.45, or the neighbours to the rear, Nos.10 & 12 Pickney Way.
8. Thus, I find the proposal would accord with the requirements of WCS core policy 57 (vii) in terms of achieving appropriate levels of amenity, including privacy and overshadowing.

#### *Other Matters*

9. Both the main parties explain that an earlier application for the same extension had been withdrawn (Council reference PL/2021/05421). This was subsequently followed by an application for a lawful development certificate for a detached outbuilding in line with the provisions under Class E of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO). This application (Council reference PL/2021/09057) was granted in December 2021 and the appellant promotes this proposal as a fallback.
10. The outbuilding would be of a similar scale to the appeal proposal, but it would have a pitched roof, lower eaves and is to accommodate a garage, gym, store, and an office. In my opinion, it has a different appearance and function to the extension and would utilise a large proportion of the garden, limiting the ability to directly extend the bungalow. I thereby have some doubt that the outbuilding would be erected if the appellant's intention, as indicated in the Council's officer report, is to create extra living space and 4 bedrooms for his growing family. However, even if I am wrong and the outbuilding is erected, as a detached shed like building and sited behind the existing bungalow it would be less visible in the street scene.
11. Whilst I accept that the materials and design of the extension are likely to be of a higher quality, I do not find that this is a determinative issue, and the development would not be seen from above as presented in the appellant's 3D images. Therefore, in my opinion, the potential fallback would not be

significantly more harmful in terms of the relationship with the host property and impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such this is a matter to which I only give limited weight.

12. The planning application received third party comments both in favour and against the proposal. Support, in particular for the removal of the existing outbuilding, and the proposal to re-render the existing bungalow do not alter my findings on the main issue.

### *Conclusion*

13. While I have found that the extension would not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, the scale and siting of the extension would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be disproportionate to the host property. It would be contrary to the development plan and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 130 and 134), and material considerations do not outweigh this conflict.

14. For the reasons set out the appeal is dismissed.

*Gill Ellis*

INSPECTOR