



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2023 by S Indermaur

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/23/3318763

9 Esmead, Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 3PR

- 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 Biagio Gugliotta against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/2022/05118, dated 29 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Government published on 19 December 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling with a hipped roof and detached garage. The road is characterised by pairs of two-storey and single-storey dwellings. The two-storey dwellings exhibit a similar simple form and character, and the appeal site is typical of this. Various extensions and alterations have occurred over time to properties in the road, however these are limited at second storey level.
6. The appellant seeks to create a subservient addition to the dwelling by setting the roof of the two-storey extension down from the eaves of the existing

property. The materials used would match the existing dwelling, and the scale and design would be subservient to the host dwelling and allow the original form of the symmetrical pair to be appreciated. However, the difference in eaves height as well as the design of the shallow lean-to roof at first floor level would not respond positively to the existing pattern of development in terms of design, rooflines and built form. Consequently, the form of the proposed first floor means the proposal would be an incongruous addition the existing dwelling.

7. In addition, the proposed first floor bay window would be positioned much lower than the existing windows at first floor level and would interrupt the projecting lower roof, which is proposed to link to the existing porch roof. Although bay windows are a key feature of surrounding properties, these are found at ground floor level and not at first floor, therefore the proposed first floor bay window would appear as a discordant feature. Together, the design and position of the windows would not reflect the design, size and position of the ones used in the main house and would create an awkward relationship with the host dwelling.
8. While I appreciate that the appellant has sought professional advice and taken care with the design, the roof form and fenestration would not enhance local distinctiveness, respond positively to the existing townscape or effectively integrate the building into its setting and to the wider character of the area.
9. The single storey extension suggested by the appellant as an alternative under permitted development would have a roof pitch closer to that of the existing dwelling and no first-floor window, so would have a materially different visual impact to the appeal scheme. While a full height extension to the boundary might have a different impact to the appeal scheme, as the appellant suggests, that scheme is not before me so I cannot be certain that it would be more harmful than the appeal proposal. Therefore, these alternatives do not change my conclusion on the appeal proposal.
10. For the reasons detailed above, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) which requires development, including extensions, to demonstrate a high standard of design.
11. Furthermore, there would be conflict with the Framework, which seeks to resist development that is of poor design and is not sympathetic to the local character.

Other Matters

12. General reference has been made to examples of other developments locally. However, these examples do not demonstrate a similar form and design to the proposed two storey extension and are not therefore directly comparable to the appeal scheme. I appreciate the efforts to minimise the impact of the proposal on No 7, however the lack of harm in this regard does not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
13. The appellant suggests the proposal would reuse materials, have high levels of insulation and less embodied carbon, however I have very little detail of these measures so can give them limited weight. There would be benefits of having

extra space in the property to accommodate for a growing family. However, these would be private benefits, and carry limited weight.

14. Together, these matters do not outweigh the significant harm identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and the resulting policy conflict.
15. I note the concerns raised about the handling of the application in terms of engagement. However, these matters are not fundamental to the planning merits of the case and have not been determinative in my recommendation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and I agree with the reasoning set out above. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR