



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025 by M Long BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/24/3350067

West Bungalow, Cobden Road, Ferndale, Swindon SN2 1DP

- 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 T Lippke against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is S/HOU/24/0473/JAAB.
 - The development proposed is to raise existing roof height with side and rear extensions, velux windows to loft area and front porch canopy.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of Eastleighton, with particular regard to sunlight, daylight and outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal dwelling and its neighbour, 'Eastleighton', are both modest bungalows that sit within large plots at one end of Cobden Road. They are similarly set back from the highway, have hipped roofs with comparable ridgeline and eaves heights, as well as corresponding front gable projections with large windows. The bungalows are angled towards each other with only a modest separation distance between them at their closest point. Consequently, the sense of symmetry between them is a defining positive feature of the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. Despite some extensions and alterations to these properties, from the front, their designs broadly reflect one another and so give the impression of a coherent and balanced pair.
5. The proposed gable-end roof form would have a large scale that would appear imposing next to the modest hipped roof form of its neighbour. Also, given its

proximity to Eastleighton, the proposal's higher ridgeline and eaves would be clearly evident. This would further accentuate its dominant design and unbalance the pair when viewed from Cobden Road. This would conflict with the Residential Extensions & Alterations: Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) insofar as it seeks that all extensions are well sited, in scale and proportion and have a roof in character with the existing dwelling.

6. Furthermore, the installation of an integral garage, erection of a large porch feature and the removal of the front gable projection would serve to further differentiate the neighbouring properties, removing the pleasing sense of symmetry between the two. Moreover, the greater scale of the appeal scheme relative to Eastleighton would appear excessively large, and its design noticeably at odds with its neighbour. This would be readily appreciable from within the site as well as from Cobden Road.
7. My attention has been directed to other developments in the area in order to help justify the appeal scheme. Nonetheless, the circumstances under which those decisions were considered is not before me to enable a meaningful comparison. Furthermore, no substantive evidence is before me to indicate that a similarly close relationship between the appeal building and its neighbour was an important characteristic in those cases. In any event, each appeal must be considered on its individual circumstances.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (2015) (Local Plan). Amongst other matters, this requires high standards of design for all types of development including in respect of the surrounding built form.

Living conditions

9. The front building line of the proposal would remain in line with that of the existing building and at the same angle relative to Eastleighton. As such, despite the proximity and scale of the proposal to the nearest neighbouring front window at Eastleighton, there would still be a large open area to the front and side of that window. This would continue to allow sunlight and daylight to reach it. Taking this into account, alongside evidence set out in the appellant's Daylight and Sunlight Report, the proposal would not result in a harmful loss of sunlight or daylight available to this window.
10. In addition, whilst the proposal would be visible from this window, the large space retained to its front and side would retain an open aspect and an acceptable quality of outlook for the occupants of Eastleighton. As such, it would not conflict with the SPD insofar as it seeks to ensure extensions safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents in terms of daylight, sunlight and visual intrusion.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of occupiers of Eastleighton with particular regard to sunlight, daylight and outlook. As such, for this main issue it would accord with Policy DE1 of the Local Plan insofar as it relates to requiring high standards of design in respect of light and outlook. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above it would conflict with this policy as a whole. An absence of harm on this main issue is a neutral consideration.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan as a whole. For the reasons given and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

R Hall

INSPECTOR