
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

by **P Brennan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/D/25/3358567

94 Manchester Road, Swindon SN1 2AJ

- 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 S Ali against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is S/HOU/24/1019/JP.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has amended the description of development from that seen on the application form to include 'erection of' and the revised wording has been used by the appellant. I have however used the original description as this correctly describes the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling, sat within a terrace of properties with slightly lower rear two-storey gabled returns arranged perpendicular to the terrace and courtyard spaces beyond. The adjacent property at No 95 has flat roofed ground and first floor extensions at the rear. While many of the properties within the wider terrace have single storey extensions to rear returns, there are no other two-storey additions to the existing returns. The terrace has rear access via an existing, publicly accessible, narrow roadway which means the rear of the terrace is visible from public vantage points. The surrounding area is a mix of commercial, community and residential properties. Together with the mix of uses, the aforementioned factors, particularly the general rhythm created by the scale and form of the existing rear returns, make important contributions to the established character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. The addition of a first-floor extension over the existing single storey building, would add significant built form to the rear of the property. Whilst it would match the rear, first floor building line of No 95, when read in conjunction with it, the proposed rear extension would result in a disproportionate form that would be out of scale to the appeal property. The flat roof nature of the development would be at visual odds

with the existing dwelling and that of the wider terrace, leading to the proposed development being architecturally incongruous with its neighbours. As such, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area.

6. The existing extensions at No 95 are clearly apparent within the immediate surroundings of the site, but I am not aware of the full circumstances that led to their construction. Nevertheless, they are a significant departure from the established characteristics of the terrace, the existence of which does not provide a compelling reason in itself to allow development which I have found to be visually harmful.
7. The proposed single storey element would sit alongside the side boundary and occupy the area that currently provides space and privacy between the rear wings of the appeal property and No 93. This space has already been partially infilled at Nos 93 and 94. This component would be proportionate to the appeal dwelling and would thereby cause no harm to the character and appearance of the site or surrounding area.
8. Despite finding that the proposed single storey element would cause no harm, the proposed first floor extension would have a demonstrably harmful effect on the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find conflict with Policies SD1 and DE1 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026. These policies provide an expectation that development would be of high-quality design, be appropriate in scale, would respect local character and relate to its context. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks development that achieves high quality design that contributes positively to local character with regard to its surroundings and context.

Other Matters

9. The appellant refers to the possibility of altering the flat roof of the first-floor extension to a pitched tiled roof. However, an amended scheme has not been submitted as part of the appeal evidence and in any event, an appeal is not an appropriate route in which to attempt to evolve a proposal. As such, this decision is based on the proposed development before me.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

P Brennan

INSPECTOR