



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2024

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/24/3347966

12 Chippenham Road, Marshfield, South Gloucestershire SN14 8NY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Elmes against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/01050/HH.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension; alterations to existing rear extension; proposed single storey utility room extension; proposed car parking (amended scheme following approval P23/03247/HH).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. 12 Chippenham Road (No 12) is within the Marshfield Conservation Area. As required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, special regard has been paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
3. Work on the side extension is underway, and to the rear, two single story extensions have been partly constructed. Notwithstanding this, the consideration of the appeal has been based on the submission as provided, rather than what has occurred on site.
4. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. Regard has been given to the revised national policy in this decision, albeit planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The particulars of this case are such that there is no requirement to seek further comment from the parties on the revised Framework, and in taking such an approach no party or their cases would be prejudiced.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and upon that of the area.

Reasons

6. Positioned within a mostly residential area, No 12 is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses that front Chippenham Road. The property is part of an estate that comprises mostly two storey houses of similar ages and styles, with many being semi-detached. No 12 occupies a corner plot position with its rear garden extending to one side of Withymead Road.

7. Although many of the houses within the estate have been extended, there remains a repeated consistency of set back of the dwellings from the roads, and this creates a strong, linear definition to the area. The straight nature of the estate roads and Chippenham Road, along with the consistent relationship of the houses to the public highway, creates a spacious linear setting to the houses, with the long continuous building lines and associated views being a distinct characteristic of the estate.
8. The corner position of No 12 would result in the broad and tall rear gabled extension being conspicuously prominent within the area. The slight set-down of the ridge would result in a limited degree of subservience to the host building, but it would do little to ameliorate the long length and dominance of the roofscape. When viewed from the side the roof would appear relentlessly monotonous, particularly so as it would appear to continue the height of the front gable.
9. The two storey element of the extension would cover most of the rear elevation of the house. Whilst it would incorporate the existing outrigger, the resultant height and breadth of that proposed would be a substantial and bulky addition to the dwelling. Taken as a whole, the extensions would dominate the host building rather than be subservient to it, and even with the single storey element, the resultant size of the house would give the property an undue prominence in the area.
10. Furthermore, the harmful impact of the extension would be experienced from long distances away. When viewed from Withymead Road the substantial bulk of the house would appear unduly prominent, as it would form a dominating and abrupt termination to the street scene. Approaching from the north, the substantial depth of the house and the impact of the roofscape would be clearly and conspicuously apparent when entering the village.
11. There are other houses nearby that have large side and rear extensions, including 11 Chippenham Road. However, this house does not have the same prominent corner position as the appeal property, and its rear extension is narrower in breadth and has a balanced first floor fenestration arrangement. A pair of semi-detached houses have been extended by the addition of a new dwelling (9A Chippenham Road), but it has replicated the style and form of the host building, and appears as part of the continuity of the long row of houses that are found to one side of the road. Given this context this new dwelling does not have the same prominence in the area. Having regard to these differences, the comparisons do not form binding precedents for allowing the appeal.
12. The Council's Householder Design Guide (2021) requires rear extensions to be visually subservient to the host in terms of scale and character. The partly implemented permission (application reference P23/03247/HH) achieves this through the retention of the existing rear gable outrigger being flanked by single storey extensions to either side. Unlike the appeal scheme, these extensions would have a legible subservience to the host building, being more organic in form as well as considerably less bulky than that proposed.
13. For these reasons, the scheme would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, and the suggested conditions would not overcome these harms. There would be conflict with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy (2013),

and also with Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) as these seek, amongst other things, that development is informed by, respects and enhances the character and distinctiveness of its context, and that which demonstrates an understanding of, and responds positively to the area.

Other Matters

14. The appeal site lies within the Cotswolds National Landscape (NL) where there is a statutory duty to protect the landscape and its scenic beauty. Although the scheme would harm the character and appearance of its host and that of the surrounding area, it would not harm the wider landscape and scenic beauty of the NL as the extended dwelling would be seen as part of the built-up area as a whole.
15. Marshfield is a small medieval market town, with a distinctive linear nature focused upon a broad High Street. Along this road are almost continuous rows of historic buildings. The high-quality historic appearance of the town, the repeated use of local stone, and the visual, functional and social dominance of the High Street and Market Place, are all part of the significance of the conservation area.
16. Although the estate and No 12 are of post-war date, the long lines of similarly aged, sized and styled houses set back from the roads behind regularly shaped front gardens of repeated sizes creates a distinctive planned cohesion, and one which contrasts the tight grain of contiguous buildings found along the High Street and the Market Place. The visual harmony of the estate and the spacious positioning of the houses serves to soften the visual transition from the historic areas of the town with the open countryside. Whilst many of the houses within the estate have been altered and / or extended, the planned layout and distinct identity of the area has been retained. In such a context, despite the size and form of the rear extension, it would retain the cohesive appearance of the estate, and as such would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion

17. The scheme would unacceptably harm both the character and appearance of the host building and that of the area, thereby conflicting with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the requirements of the Framework, that outweigh this finding. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR