



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2023

by K Reeves BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/23/3323950

Dairy House, Dairy Lane, Horton, Wiltshire SN10 3ND

- 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 and Mrs Reeve against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2023/00189, dated 10 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing garage and carport and games room over to form garage and habitable accommodation to be used as ancillary to the main dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal building and site.

Reasons

3. Dairy House is a substantial detached dwelling located in the village of Horton. The appeal building is a single storey building with storage space within the roof, which sits in close proximity to the dwelling. Its scale and simple form and finish, with relatively unbroken roofslopes, save for four small rooflights on the rear, and limited openings in the external walls, results in the building being read as an ancillary and subservient structure to the dwelling.
4. A flat roof extension would be constructed on the rear of the appeal building, in place of an existing car port and garden store. It would extend a significant distance from the rear elevation of the building, resulting in the overall depth of the building being effectively doubled. Furthermore, its flat roof form would be at odds with the traditional pitched roof form of the appeal building. Although it would be finished in red brick to match the appeal building, its scale and form would not be reflective of, or sympathetic to, the character and appearance of the host building. It would result in an incongruent addition that would compromise the future understanding and reading of the appeal building.
5. There is an existing structure attached to the rear of the building, which already has a negative impact on the appeal building's character and appearance. However, it is a relatively light weight structure that would be easily reversible. In contrast, the proposed extension would be a significantly bulkier and more permanent addition that would look even more out of place on the rear of the building.

6. The proposal also includes the installation of three dormer windows on the rear of the appeal building. The dormers would be sited close to each other in a cluttered group. The number of dormers proposed and their cramped positioning on the roof would lead to an over domestication of the building, particularly when seen together with the large flat roof extension. Furthermore, the central dormer would protrude past the eaves of the appeal building on to the roof of the extension. This would lead to a contrived appearance that would be at odds with the vernacular of the building.
7. When looking at the proposed extension and dormer windows together, the currently subservient appearance of the appeal building would be lost. The proposed development would result in the primacy of the dwelling being challenged, which would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the appeal site.
8. It is noted that the rear of the building is not easily viewable from the public realm due to existing planting, but views of the proposed development would still be easily attainable from within the appeal site itself. Furthermore, the Council's policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) require development to be of good design and I do not consider that the proposed development achieves that.
9. My attention has been drawn to other sites in the local area where dormer windows have been installed on the roof of an ancillary residential building. However, I have been provided with limited information to explain the background and context to the decisions that were made to allow those developments. In any event, the presence of these other dormer windows in the local area does not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the appeal building and site in this particular case. Moreover, I have determined the proposal on its own individual merits based on the evidence before me.
10. For these reasons, the proposal conflicts with Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015), which seeks, in part, a high standard of design and for local distinctiveness to be enhanced. Additionally, the proposal conflicts with the Framework, which seeks for development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has suggested that a condition could be attached, or legal agreement secured, to prevent the appeal building being separated from the dwelling at Dairy House. The prevention of the appeal building being used as a separate residential unit would not address the proposal's harm to the character and appearance of the building and site.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations that outweigh this finding. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Reeves

INSPECTOR