



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2025

by Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/24/3348309

Long View, Causeway End, Brinkworth, Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 5DL

- 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 Olaleke Alabi against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/04027.
 - The development proposed is erection of detached garage, Garage Conversion, External/internal alterations, Porch and Attic Conversion and associated works.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises Long View, a 2-storey detached dwelling located on Causeway End in Brinkworth, which is part of a group of 5 dwellings which were granted planning permission in 2021. Although Brinkworth as a whole has experienced organic development with some variation in the architectural style and scale of dwellings, these 5 particular dwellings are especially large in terms of their size and scale in their local context.
4. Long View is set forward from Long House by several metres, and as it sits higher than the adjacent highway, the dwelling has a prominent presence in the street scene. Its side (western) element incorporates a subservient ridge, which presently serves to add interest to the street scene. The proposed development would raise the single-storey western element by an additional 2 storeys. This would include extending the roof by some margin across the right-hand side of the front elevation of Long View.
5. As such, the extended roof would lack subservience with the remainder of the dwelling. This would be clearly noticeable in the street scene, given Long View's siting in relation to Long House. This would be contrary to Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide (adopted 2024), which provides that, amongst other things, proposed extensions and alterations should not dominate the existing building: in other words they should be subservient and appear as additions in a 'supporting' role. Moreover, the resulting increased bulk and massing of Long View would mean that Long View would appear overly-large in its context, and its distinctive western element (referred to above), would be lost.

6. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with parts iii. and vi. of Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted 2015) which provide that, amongst other things, applications for new development must demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to the character of Wiltshire through responding positively to the existing townscape features in terms of built form, height, mass, and scale, to effectively integrate the building into its setting, and making efficient use of land whilst taking account of the characteristics of the site and the local context to deliver an appropriate development which relates effectively to the immediate setting and to the wider character of the area.
7. The proposed development would also conflict with paragraph 135 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which provides that, amongst other things, planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).

Other Matters

8. As the impacts of the proposed development would be localised to Causeway End, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the wider landscape. This is a neutral matter, which does not weigh in favour of the proposed development. The appellant has attempted to negotiate with the Council, resulting in the revised scheme before me. However, in planning terms this is also a neutral matter. The proposed development would provide enhanced living conditions for the occupiers of Long View, but as the benefits in this regard would be mainly private in nature, they attract little weight in support of the proposed development.
9. Overall, none of the other considerations material to the proposed development indicate that this appeal decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR